THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD IN SALVATION

Biblical Essays

T&T CLARK BIBLICAL STUDIES

E. EARLE ELLIS

T&T clark

The Sovereignty of God in Salvation

This page intentionally left blank

The Sovereignty of God in Salvation

Biblical Essays

E. Earle Ellis

Published by T&T Clark
A Continuum imprint
The Tower Building, 11 York Road, London SE1 7NX
80 Maiden Lane, Suite 704, New York, NY 10038

www.continuumbooks.com

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Copyright © E. Earle Ellis, 2009

E. Earle Ellis has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the Author of this work.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Typeset by Free Range Book Design & Production Ltd
Printed and bound in Great Britain by the MPG Book Group

ISBN-10: HB: 0–567–03413–5
ISBN-13: HB: 978–0–567–03413–7

For
The Rev., the Hon. Jonathan Fletcher
of Wimbledon

Christian Brother
Gracious Host
Lasting Friend

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Preface ix
Abbreviations xi

1 God's Sovereign Grace in Salvation and the Nature of Man's Free Will 1

Reformed Understanding of Salvation 2
Election to Salvation and Free Will 5
Calvinism and Hyper-Calvinism 7
General Predestination and Free Will 8
Aspects of God's Will 8
Divine Predestination and History 10
Salvation History and History 11
The Finite God of Free Will Theism 13
Conclusion 17

2 Paul, Predestined Apostle of Christ Jesus: Whence the Name and the Title? 18

Paul's Name 18
Paul's Title: ʾΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ʾΙΗΣΟΥ 21

3 Colossians 1:12–20: *Christus Creator*, *Christus Salvator* 31

The Historical Setting of Colossians 31
The Literary Form of Col 1:12–20 35
The Teaching of Col 1:12–20 38
Introduction 38
God's Gracious Action of Salvation (Col 1:12–14) 39
Christ: The Head of Creation, the Head of the Church (Col 1:15–20) 42

4 Perspectives on Biblical Interpretation 47

Old Testament Issues 49
History 49
Transmission 53
New Testament Issues 57
Gospels 58
Acts and Letters 63
Confessional and Hermeneutical Traditions 70
Evangelical Interpretation 71
Method 73
Subjective Historical-Critical Interpretation 74
Postmodernism 74
Non-Historical Literary Interpretation 75
Conclusion 78

5 Paul and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric 80

Introduction 81
Paul's Background 83
Paul as a Jewish Christian Prophet 90
Revelation and Rhetoric in I Corinthians 92
Conclusion 94

6 Dynamic Equivalence Theory, Feminist Ideology and Three Recent Bible Versions 96

Two Philosophies of Translation 97
Biblical Paraphrase Serving Feminist Ideology 98
Biblical Paraphrase as 'Holy Bible?' 101
Conclusion 106

Index of Passages 107
Index of Authors 119
Index of Subjects 125

Preface

The present volume is a revision and expansion of delivered lectures and written essays, four of which have been published earlier. To their editors and publishers a word of acknowledgment and appreciation is here happily given.[1] Chapters 2 and 5 are first published here.

The overarching theme, the sovereignty of God in salvation, concerns his comprehensive sovereignty (1) in individual salvation, (2) in his determining and inspiring the individual tradents and secretaries and authors of the biblical writings,[2] (3) in the history of his salvation (and judgment) plan and of the continuing and developing interpretation of his written Word,[3] and (4) in the mediating (or withholding) of the true meaning, the Word of God content, of those writings[4] to the reader or interpreter of them. The first aspect

[1] Chapters 1, 3, 4 and 6 appeared respectively in *SWJT* 44, 3 (2002), 28–43; *Interpreting the New Testament Text. FS H. W. Hoehner*, ed. D. L. Bock *et al.* (Wheaton, IL, 2006), 415–428; *JETS* 45 (2002), 473–495; *ET* 115 (2003–2004), 7–12.

[2] Cf. B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Phillipsburg, NJ, 1999 [1948]), 155: 'If God wished to give His people a series of letters like Paul's, He prepared a Paul to write them, and the Paul He brought to the task was a Paul who spontaneously would write just such letters.' The same applies to all the biblical authors and to all the tradents and secretaries who stood behind and with them. Cf. P. D. Gardner, *The Gifts of God …* (Lanham, MD, 1994), 113f.

[3] Cf. Gen 17:21; I Sam 16:7–13; II Sam 7:11–17; Isa 46:9ff.; 60:21f.; Jer 31:1, 31–34; Ezek 36:16–28; Dan 12:4, 8; Mk 1:14f.; Lk 9:30f. (ἔξοδος), 51; Acts 7:2–53; Rom 5:6; Gal 4:4; I Pet 1:5; II Pet 3:2–13; Rev 11:16ff.; O. Cullmann, 'God's Lordship Over Time,' *Christ and Time* (Eugene, OR, 1999 [2nd edn., 1967]), 69–80; idem, 'Revelation as History,' *Salvation in History* (London, 1967), 48–64.

[4] Cf. Dan 12:4, 8ff.; Mt 13:10–14 T + Q; 15:6 par; 22:29 par; Lk 9:45; II Cor 3:14f.; E. E. Ellis, 'The Word of God Hidden and Revealed,' *Christ and the Future in New Testament History*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2001), 273–278; idem, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 6th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 25–28.

of the theme is most evident in chapters 1 and 3; the second, with respect to the Apostle Paul, in chapter 2.

It is my presupposition and perspective, which I believe are drawn from Scripture itself, that God directs and brings about not only the salvation of individuals but also the redemption of the fallen creation, the whole of history in which that salvation is ordained and effected, and the full literary process by which God's person and his purpose of salvation and judgement are revealed to his people in the Holy Bible. Chapters 2, 4, 5 and 6 are concerned to detail these matters.

Chapter 2 is a lecture given during a conference at Moore Theological College honoring the retirement of Dr Paul Barnett, Bishop of North Sydney and lecturer in early Christianity at Macquarie University, Moore College and Regent College. I am glad to dedicate it to him here in published form.

I met Jonathan Fletcher over thirty years ago when he was a curate at Great St Helen's Church, Bishop's Gate, London. Almost every year since then he has given me a room in his parsonage, first in Islington and afterwards in Wimbledon, during my annual six-week London sojourn doing research and writing at the British Library.

Most graciously, he has provided me with kitchen privileges and the use of his library. Together we have enjoyed tennis matches at the Wimbledon championships, plays in the West End and trips as far as Repton in the north and the Isle of Wight to the south. I am most grateful to him for these enduring kindnesses and wonderful memories, and am very happy to dedicate this book to him.

I wish to express my deep appreciation to T & T Clark and The Continuum International Publishing Group for issuing this book; to my secretary, Miss Christa Friel, who brought the manuscript into commendable form with much patience and commitment to the task; to my former student and present colleague, Dr S. Aaron Son, for preparing the indices; and to Southwestern Seminary for providing facilities and support for the research and writing.

Easter 2008

E. Earle Ellis
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Abbreviations

†	Date of Death
=	Equals mark
BDAG	*A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament*, ed. W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, 3rd edn. (Chicago, 2000)
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*
BT	*The Babylonian Talmud*, 35 vols. in 18, ed. I Epstein (London, 1952)
DCW	D. Daube, *Collected Works: Talmudic Law; New Testament Judaism*; *Biblical Law and Literature*, 3 vols. (Berkeley, CA, 2003)
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
DT	Dutch Text (Translation)
DTIB	*Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. K. J. Vanhoozer (Grand Rapids, 2005).
ESV	English Standard Version of the Bible
ET	English Text (Translation)
ET	*Expository Times*
FS	Festschrift (or memorial volume)
FT	French Text (Translation)
GT	German Text (Translation)
HE	Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica (Ecclesiastical History)*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
IJO	*Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*, 3 vols., ed. W. Ameling (Tübingen, 2004)
ISBE	*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, revised edn., 4 vols., ed. G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, 1979–88)
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*

JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KJV	*King James Version of the Bible*
M	Mishnah. Cf. H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (London, 1933)
Mek	Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael. Cf. J. Z. Lauterbach, ed., *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1976)
MPG	*Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca*, 161 vols., ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1857–66)
MPL	*Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina*, 221 vols., ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1879–90 [1844–64])
NBD	*New Bible Dictionary*, 3rd edn., ed. J. D. Douglas *et al.* (Leicester UK and Downers Grove, IL, 1996 [1962])
NIDCC	*New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas (Grand Rapids, 1978).
NIDNTT	*New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, 4 vols., ed. C. Brown *et al.* (Grand Rapids, 1986); cf. *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum Neuen Testament*, ed. L. Coenen *et al.* (Wuppertal, 1971).
NIDOTTE	*New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, ed. W. van Gemeren, 5 vols. (Grand Rapids, 1997)
NIV	*New International Version of the Bible*
NIVI	*New International Version: Inclusive Language Edition*
NKJV	*New King James Version of the Bible*
NRSV	*New Revised Standard Version of the Bible*
NTA	*New Testament Apocrypha*, 2nd edn., 2 vols., ed. W. Schneemelcher (Cambridge, 1992)
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NPNF$^{1, 2}$	*Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First and Second Series*, 14 + 14 vols., eds. P. Schaff *et a*l., Edinburgh 1900.
OCD^{2}	*The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd edn., ed. N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard (Oxford, 1970)
OCD^{3}	*The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd edn., ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (Oxford, 1996)

ODCC	*The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd edn., ed. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (Oxford, 1997)
par(r)	parallel(s) in other Gospel(s)
Q	traditions or episodes common to Matthew and Luke (1) in agreement against Mark or (2) absent from Mark
RSV	*Revised Standard Version of the Bible*
Sales	*Salesianum*
SWBTS	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
SWJT	*Southwestern Journal of Theology*
T	Synoptic Gospels, Triple Tradition; Tosefta
TB	*Tyndale Bulletin*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ed. G. Kittel, tr. G. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, 1964–76 [1933–73])
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. G. J. Botterweck *et al.* (Grand Rapids, 1974–)
TNIV	*Today's New International Version*
TZT	*Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*
ZNTW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

This page intentionally left blank

1

God's Sovereign Grace in Salvation and the Nature of Man's Free Will

The nature and relationship of divine sovereignty and human free will is a deep and long-standing theological issue. The present chapter offers only a number of observations on the question. It may hopefully contribute something (1) to a clarification of some traditional questions and (2) to a response to a new 'open God' proposal that human free will is so autonomous that its decisions are beyond even God's foreknowledge.

Traditionally, a Calvinist viewpoint has been affirmed by Anglican, Presbyterian and Reformed denominations and by Particular Baptists of seventeenth-century England. Anabaptists, General Baptists, Mennonites, Wesleyan Methodists and others followed Arminian views.[1] The Arminians argued, in effect, that God's grace places man's[2] will in neutral gear and that each one in one's 'free

[1] With variations. They are rooted in 'The Five Arminian Articles' (1610) in which salvation grace 'is not irresistible' (Art. IV) and that Christ died 'for every man, so that He has obtained for them all … redemption and the forgiveness of sins; … (Art. II). '[T]hose who are incorporated into Christ … [will persevere] if only they … desire His help, and are not inactive …' (Art. V; cf. Art I). Cf. P. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, 1990 [1st edn., 1877; 6th edn., 1931]), III, 545–49. Cf. *ODCC*, 107f. ('Arminianism'); R. C. Clouse, 'Arminianism,' *NIDCC*, 70.

[2] The term 'man' is used in a generic sense of *homo sapiens*, including the individual and the corporate, male and female, young and old, black and white. There is no other English word that is fully equivalent to it.

agency' chooses to accept or to reject Christ. They regarded evangelism, then, as an effort to persuade the human will to turn from self and to follow Christ.

Reformed Understanding of Salvation

The evangelical Reformed churches on the Continent and in the British Isles produced numerous confessions from Zwingli's Articles (1523) to the Westminster Confession of Faith (1647) and the Reformed, i.e. Particular Baptists' Second London Confession (1677, 1689), which was republished as the Philadelphia Confession (1742).[3] On questions of salvation these confessions, like the Westminster Confession (1647) of the Presbyterians,[4] affirmed the Reformation view of humanity's predicament and salvation that has been summarized under the acronym TULIP: Total depravity, Unconditional election, Limited atonement, Irresistible grace, and Perseverence of the saints.[5] Evangelism from this perspective is an appealing (πείθειν) and witnessing (διαμαρτύρεσθαι) to unbelievers for 'repentance (μετάνοια) toward God and faith (πίστις) toward our Lord Jesus Christ,'[6] while recognizing that saving repentance[7] and faith[8] are both gifts from God and not abilities or virtues of the human will.

[3] The latter was accepted by the Charleston (SC) Baptist Association, conveniently reprinted in T. & D. George's *Baptist Confessions, Covenants and Catechisms*, 2nd edn (Nashville, 1999), 56–93, 68–76. It was basically the Westminster Confession, adapted to certain Baptist distinctives.

[4] Schaff (note 1), III, 598–573.

[5] Cf. Schaff (note 1), III, 550–597: 'The Canons of the Synod of Dort' (AD 1618–19), which gave the Reformed response to the Arminian views.

[6] Acts 20:21; 28:23; cf. Mt 28:19f.

[7] E.g. II Tim 2:25: '… that God might give repentance (δῴη μετάνοιαν) to them unto (εἰς) a knowledge of the truth;' Acts 5:31: 'God exalted [Jesus] that he might give repentance to Israel …;' 11:18: '… God has given repentance unto life (τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωὴν ἔδωκεν) even to the Gentiles.' Cf. Rom 2:4.

[8] E.g. II Thess 2:13: 'God chose you from the beginning for salvation by sanctification in the Spirit and faith in the truth.' Cf. Mt 16:17; Rom 10:17; Eph 2:8–10. John Calvin (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1960 [1559], 3, 1, 4; 3, 3, 21) saw that 'faith itself has no other source than the Spirit' and that 'repentance [is] God's free gift.'

Rightly understood, *total depravity* does not mean that fallen man is as evil as possible but that every aspect of his being – mind, will, emotions – is under the effects of sin, that is, of Original Sin in the Garden. Thus 'all [corporately] in Adam die' (I Cor 15:22). 'Therefore, just as through one man sin entered (εἰσῆλθεν) the world, and death through sin, so also death spread (διῆλθεν) to all men because (ἐφ' ᾧ) all had sinned (ἥμαρτον),' i.e. in the Garden.[9] That is, all Adam's offspring were corporate participants in his sin and thus in its effects. Therefore, even babies are 'unclean' and die though they are without personal sin.[10]

Unconditional election does not mean that God chose to save without rhyme or reason but that 'he chose (ἐξελέξατο) us in [Christ] before the foundation of the world' (Eph 1:4), each one 'according to the counsel of his own will' (Eph 1:11) and not because of any merit in those that he chose. *Limited atonement* does not mean that Christ's death is limited in its ability to save everyone but that it is effective to save only those who were corporate participants in his death in AD 33[11] and who, therefore, belong to Christ by grace through faith.

Irresistible grace does not mean that God forces us to faith but that as the 'gracious lover of my soul' he moves our will from opposition to repentance and faith, and that as 'the hound of heaven' (Francis

[9] Rom 5:12. Jerome's Latin Vulgate translation of ἐφ' ᾧ as *in quo* ('in whom') is grammatically permissible and theologically correct, but the syntax and usage favour the translation 'because.' The same meaning ensues, however, from the correct pluperfect translation of ἥμαρτον. Cf. B. Fischer *et al.*, eds., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1969), II, 1755 (Rom 5:12); E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 6th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 58ff.; idem, *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*, 2nd edn. (Atlanta, GA, 2006), 118ff. Further on corporate solidarity see below, notes 11, 25.

[10] I Cor 7:14; Rom 5:14. Cf. Ellis, *Paul's Use* (note 9), 59; idem, *Christ and the Future in New Testament History*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2001), 148–154, 171ff., passim. If at least one parent is 'in Christ,' however, the child is 'holy' (I Cor 7:14).

[11] Scripture teaches the corporate nature of man and the corporate as well as (subsequent, incorporated) individual participation of God's chosen ones in Christ's death. We were corporately 'with Christ' (μετ' ἐμοῦ) in his trials, were 'crucified with him' (συνεσταυρώθη), died with him (ἀπεθάνομεν σὺ Χριστῷ) and were buried with him (συνταφέντες αὐτῷ) Cf. Lk 22:28; Rom 6:6; 8:1; Gal 2:20 (19); Rom 6:8, 5; Col 3:3; 2:12; Ellis, *Christ* (note 10), 85–88, 148–157; 171ff.; idem, *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society*, 5th edn. (Eugene, OR 2005), 13f. See below, note 25.

Thompson)[12] and 'the good shepherd' (Jn 10:11) he does not rest until he saves us from our running from him and from our lost estate. Something of this comes through in the expression of Texas Baptists, 'He surrendered to preach.' But it applies equally to all believers, all those who 'surrendered to Christ.' A bird caught in a thicket or a lamb in a crevice may struggle against its rescuer, but when it is firmly in his control, it yields. So it is also with God's elect.

Perseverance of the saints does not mean that everyone who 'walks the aisle' or who once had a 'revival high' will inherit everlasting life (cf. Mt 10:22; 22:14). It means that the Holy Spirit, who brought us to new birth[13] and who 'began the good work [of salvation] …, will complete it until the Day of Jesus Christ' (Phil 1:6) and that this very perseverance does not depend on our human ability but on God's faithfulness and gracious purpose toward us.

> When I was converted at age 11 on Easter morning in First Baptist Church, Dania, Florida, the pastor's instruction spoke of my free agency in 'deciding for' Christ and of 'eternal security' that would prevent me thereafter from choosing against Him. But was my will less free after salvation than before? In that context, and doubtless with the influence of my Methodist grandmother, 'the perseverance of the saints' made no sense to me until I discerned the biblical doctrine of election[14] so beautifully expressed in the hymn:
>
> I sought the Lord, and afterward I knew
> He moved my soul to seek him, seeking me
> It was not I who found, O Savior true
> No, I was found by thee.[15]

Any inclinations that we had to accept Christ or to persevere in him derived not from any virtue in our human wills but from the 'sweet, sweet Spirit' of God drawing and holding us to himself. Approaching the gates of the kingdom of God we see over them the words, 'Whosoever will let him take of the water of life freely' (Rev 22:17); but after entering, we see over the inside of the gates the words, 'Chosen before the foundation of the world' (Eph 1:4).

[12] Francis Thompson, 'The Hound of Heaven,' *Selected Poems* (London, 1909), 51–56.
[13] E.g. Jn 3:5–8; Gal 4:29; cf. I Pet 1:23.
[14] E.g. Jn 15:16; Acts 13:48; Gal 1:15f.; Eph 1:4f.; I Pet 1:1f.
[15] Anonymous, 'I Sought the Lord and Afterward I Knew,' *Hymns*, 17th edn., ed. P. Beckwith (Chicago, 1967), 78.

Let me comment on two questions related to this theological theme: does election limit the number who can be saved? Does election inhibit evangelism?

Election to Salvation and Free Will

Some suppose that if our will is 'free' to accept or reject Christ, many will accept him. But is that true? If our first parents (Gen 1–3), whose wills were truly free, chose against God, do we suppose that any of their children, sullied by sin from earliest experiences, would make a more godly choice than they? Would we, who were at enmity with God,[16] controlled by ego, surrounded by a thousand temptations (Adam and Eve faced one), make a better choice than they? Hardly. Our will in its 'free agency' is 'freed from righteousness' and bound to our ego (Rom 6:20). It always says no to God. This is what Martin Luther called *The Bondage of the Will*.[17] 'Free will' is precisely what God permits to the terminally unrepentant,[18] and it is a one-way ticket to destruction in Hell. If salvation came through our free choice, we would all be lost. No one would be saved except Jesus Christ.

Whether one *could* repent and believe is an irrelevant question since one's will is prior to one's ability. If one will not act, the ability to act never comes into the issue.[19]

[16] E.g. Rom 5:10; Col 1:21.

[17] M. Luther, *The Bondage of the Will*, tr. and ed. J. I. Packer *et al.* (London, 1957). Cf. also John Calvin, *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will* (Grand Rapids, 1996); Jonathan Edwards, *Freedom of the Will* (New Haven, CT, 1957), 169–273 (Part II).

[18] E.g. in Rom 9:22f. Paul uses the passive, 'fitted (κατηρτισμένα) for destruction,' for the 'vessels of wrath;' but for the 'vessels of mercy' he uses the active voice: 'which [God] made ready beforehand for glory.' Cf. W. H. Griffith Thomas, 'Of Predestination and Election' [Article XVII], *The Principles of Theology. An Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles* (London, 1930), 236–257: 'The Article strictly and significantly limits the reference to the predestination of the believer to life …. [It] involves … leaving those who are not predestined to themselves' (238). Cf. also F. Davidson, *Pauline Predestination* (London, 1946), 30–36.

[19] Cf. L. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 14th edn. (Edinburgh, 1988), 247f. For the Christian the matter is more complex. The regenerate will delights in God's law but, because it is still influenced by its previous state, it often does not do God's will: Becoming holy as God is holy is a lifelong process. Cf. I Pet 1:15f.; Rom 7:22–25; 12:1; I Cor 3:17; Eph 4:22–24; 5:27; Col 3:1–14; Mt 5:48; Ellis, *Christ* (note 10), 150f., 153.

In the face of this universal rejection of God, God has chosen to save some. As Jesus said to his pupils, 'You did not choose me, but I chose you ….'[20] It is in this context that the doctrine of predestination and election to salvation can be seen to be wonderful, glorious expressions of God's mercy and grace to the fallen children of Adam. God's predestination assures that from a universally rejecting race and nation 'the remnant shall be saved.'[21]

Scripture offers many examples of God's predestination of individuals from Abraham to Moses to David and Jeremiah and Paul.[22] If they were chosen for a particular task, how much more to salvation. We may be confident that such predestination and election apply not only to certain believers but to each and every one of God's chosen ones, his elect.[23] As the Apostle Paul teaches, God predestined (προορίζειν) us 'in Christ.'[24] But the fact that we are chosen 'in (the corporate) Christ' does not exclude the fact that we are also chosen individually to be incorporated 'into Christ.'[25]

This came home to me years after I was converted. I was a law student at the University of Virginia, president of the Baptist Student Union, active in InterVarsity and Arminian in my thinking. At an InterVarsity retreat I spoke with a staff member of my struggle to know whether God was calling me into the ministry. He replied, 'Take your time. If God is calling you into the ministry, he probably began with your grandfather.' Long afterward my uncle confided, 'Earle, your grandfather's first male child died in infancy. He asked God for another son and promised that, if the Lord granted his request, he would dedicate him to Christ's ministry. I was that son, but I never felt a call to ministry. I believe that God fulfilled your grandfather's promise in you.' At

[20] Jn 15:16; cf. Jn 6:37, 44: 'All the Father gives me will come to me.' 'No one can come to me unless the Father draws him ….' Cf. Jn 10:27ff.; 17:11f.; Mk 13:20 par; Acts 1:2; 9:15; I Cor 1:27f.; Rom 9:11; 11:5ff.; Eph 1:4; Col 3:12; I Thess 1:4; Jas 2:5; I Pet 1:1f.; Rev 17:14.

[21] Isa 10:22f.; Zech 8:11–12; Rom 9:27. Cf. Rom 8:29–30.

[22] Gen 12:1–3; Exod 3:10, 15; I Kg 8:16; Jer 1:5; Acts 9:15–16; Rom 9:10–18; Gal 1:15f.

[23] Rom 8:29f., 33; I Cor 1:27–29; Jas 2:5.

[24] Eph 1:11.

[25] Rom 6:3f.; Gal 3:27. On the corporate Christ cf. Ellis, *History* (note 9), 118ff., 144ff.; idem, *Christ* (note 10), 36, 58–61, 85–88, 142f., 148–157, 163f., 171–175; idem, *Theology* (note 11), 8–14, 43f.; idem, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity*, 3rd edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 110ff.; S. Aaron Son, *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology* (*Analecta Biblica* 142) (Rome, 2001), passim, and the literature cited (distributed by Loyola Press, Chicago). See above, note 11.

seminary I pursued biblical exegesis and read, among others, patristic writers, the Reformers and scholars of the Old Princeton School. Soon my Arminian reading of Scripture vanished, and I understood the Bible in a new light.[26]

Calvinism and Hyper-Calvinism

There is no question that some have a twisted Calvinism. Examples are (1) the elder who told the Calvinist missionary, William Carey, that God 'would save the heathen without your help or mine;' (2) those mentioned in Iain Murray's *Spurgeon v. Hyper-Calvinism*;[27] and (3) others who have no interest in evangelism. In at least two respects they fail to understand what biblical Calvinists have always recognized: (1) Christ's invitation to salvation is universal,[28] and he commands the church to proclaim the gospel to all;[29] (2) God uses means to effect salvation, and we believers are the instruments that he uses. Reformed Christians who recognized this have been great instruments of evangelism. The king of France during the Reformation said that he would rather face a battalion of enemy troops than one Calvinist preacher convinced that he was doing the will of God. John Knox prayed, 'O God, give me Scotland or I die.' The Reformed preacher, George Whitefield,[30] was the greatest evangelist of the Methodist movement. Among Baptists, perhaps the foremost example was the great Calvinist preacher, Charles Spurgeon. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the denomination sending out the most missionaries, I am told, was that of the

[26] We all read Scripture through our own lenses, i.e. the presuppositions which often if not always determine the meaning that we derive from the text. The interpretive process should be an oscillation in which we allow Scripture to speak back to us and, hopefully, to alter our presuppositions so that we increasingly receive not only our data but also our presuppositions from the Bible. But God remains sovereign. He will unveil to submissive listeners those Scriptures that, in his purpose, he deems useful for their lives and ministries. Other Scriptures he may leave veiled in part or in whole. Thus, our affirmations about the Bible's meaning are in the end not 'proofs;' they remain confessional and partial. Cf. Ellis, 'The Role of the Prophet in the Quest for Truth,' *Christ* (note 10), 255–278, 269–278.

[27] I. Murray, *Spurgeon v. Hyper-Calvinism: The Battle for Gospel Truth* (Edinburgh, 1995).

[28] E.g. Mt 11:28; 22:14; Jn 7:37; Rev. 22:17.

[29] E.g. Mt 28:19; Acts 1:8; cf. 20:21.

[30] Cf. A. A. Dallimore, *George Whitefield*, 3rd edn., 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1995), I, 403–410.

Presbyterians. Their zeal was sapped not because of Reformed theology but because of the inroads of theological liberalism.

If a Reformed understanding of Scripture can be misunderstood, Arminianism also has its problems. By making 'salvation faith' a divine-human synergism, it logically appears to end up with a salvation by works.[31] It apparently supposes that God makes salvation (or healing) 'available' to any one who can exercise enough faith to receive it. But according to Scripture God does not make salvation available, he saves! He does not make healing available, he heals!

Probably most Protestant evangelicals are a Calvinist/Arminian mixture or, to coin a phrase, 'Calminians.' Both Calvinists and Arminians can, however, by God's grace live and work together, each of us giving faithful witness to our convictions about the Bible's teaching and at the same time showing love and respect for those with whom we differ. If I no longer agree with my dear Methodist grandmother on this matter, I love her no less and am fully confident that I shall be with her again on resurrection morning. Then we shall all have clearer vision about a number of theological differences (I Cor 13:9–12).

General Predestination and Free Will

A different but related question is God's predestination of all things and man's self-evident free agency in all the mundane affairs of life. In this respect at least four different aspects of God's will are revealed in various biblical contexts.

Aspects of God's Will

1. God *permits* moral evil, both in the angelic and in the human sphere. In his governance of the world he allows good angels to battle evil angels[32] and demons = evil angels to possess individuals and to seduce them to evil.[33] He specifically permitted Satan to

[31] Cf. Berkhof (note 19), 478f.
[32] I.e. in the context of apocalyptic visions, e.g. Dan 10:13; Rev 12:7.
[33] E.g. Acts 13:6–10; I Tim 4:1–5.

provoke disobedience in our first parents,[34] to bring Job under oppression,[35] to move David to sin[36] and to tempt our Lord Jesus Christ[37] and Christians.[38] He also permits human beings to work innumerable evil acts against their neighbors from Joseph's brothers selling him into slavery to Nero's slaughtering a 'vast multitude' of Christians.[39] God is never represented as initiating evil nor as enticing anyone to evil,[40] however, and he always has a good end in view when he permits evil. Sometimes he reveals that end to us;[41] often he does not.

2. God's will sometimes refers to his *desire*. He wants us to keep his commandments;[42] he desires (βούλεσθαι) that 'no one should perish but that all should come to repentance.'[43] In a fallen and rebellious creation, however, God's desire is seldom if ever fulfilled. Even relatively righteous actions of unbelievers are still motivated by their ego.[44] It was Augustin, I believe, who in this context rightly stated, 'The virtues of the pagans are but noble vices.'
3. God's *conditional will* is expressed in many prophecies, for example, certain promises to Israel if she obeys[45] or if she repents.[46]
4. All aspects of God's will – permission, desire, condition – are perfectly within his knowledge and control. From beginning to end they are present in his omniscience, and no potentiality catches him by surprise. All these aspects are taken into account in his predestined or *ordained will*,[47] the aspect that relates most directly to our topic.

[34] Gen 3:2–5; cf. Rev 12:9.
[35] E.g. Job 1:9–12; II Cor 12:7f. Cf. Martin Luther's observation: the Devil is God's Devil, i.e. on God's leash: he is used by God and can do only what God permits.
[36] Cf. II Sam 24:1 with I Chron 21:1.
[37] E.g. Mt 4:1–11 Q.
[38] E.g. II Cor 11:3.
[39] Tacitus, *Annals* 15, 44.
[40] Cf. Jas 1:13ff.
[41] E.g. Gen 37–50; 50:20; Rom 9:17; Exod 9:16.
[42] E.g. Lev 18:4; Mt 19:17.
[43] II Pet 3:9.
[44] E.g. Ps 14:2f.; Eccl 7:20; Isa 64:6f. See below, note 77.
[45] E.g. Dt 11:26ff.; I Sam 12:13ff.; I Kg 9:4–8; Isa 1:19f.; Jer 7:5ff.
[46] E.g. Jer 18:5–17.
[47] Traditionally called God's 'decrees.'

Divine Predestination and History

The Scriptures abundantly attest to God's prediction of future events and consequently to his certain foreknowledge of them. If he did not foreknow them, he could not foretell them. Yet these events also involve the self-evident free acts of will of various individuals. God also foreknows such future volitions; otherwise, he could not foreknow the events that result from and are dependent upon those volitions. Consequently, the future free acts of will are necessary and certain.[48] Among numerous such acts[49] that, according to the Scriptures, are predicted and fulfilled are Israel's entry, slavery and Exodus from Egypt;[50] Joseph's role in its Egyptian sojourn;[51] Absalom's rebellion against David;[52] Josiah's future reform;[53] the future conduct and fate of Ahab,[54] Hazael[55] and Cyrus;[56] Antiochus IV's (215–164 BC) assault on the Jews and on the Jerusalem temple.[57]

In the New Testament Jesus predicts his denial by Peter[58] and his betrayal by Judas.[59] Yet these were viewed as free and responsible actions since they required repentance and brought judgment. Old Testament prophets and Jesus predicted, respectively, the 586 BC and AD 70 destructions of Jerusalem and their consequences,[60] and the

[48] This is the basis from which the arguments of Jonathan Edwards (note 17, 239–273, 239 = Part II, §11–13) proceed.

[49] Edwards (note 17, 239–273 = Part II, §11–13) gives an extensive list and shows how fatal such predictions are to the Arminian notion of 'free will.' Cf. II Sam 23:10ff.; Isa 42:9; 44:7; 45:11; 46:9f.; 48:5; Jer 1:5; Dan 2:28f.; Acts 15:16ff.; I Pet 1:1f.

[50] Gen 15:13f. God's promise to Abraham (Gen 15:5f.; 22:16ff.) is also predestined to be fulfilled and belongs to 'the immutability of his will' (τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ, Heb 6:17).

[51] Gen 37:5–9; 40–41; 50:15–20.

[52] II Sam 12:11f.; 15:13f.

[53] I Kg 13:1–6, 32.

[54] I Kg 21:20ff.; 22:13–28, 34, 37f.

[55] II Kg 8:12f.; 10:32.

[56] Isa 44:28; Jer 29:10–14; II Chron 36:22f.

[57] Dan 8:9–14; 11:31f. Cf. J. G. Baldwin, *Daniel* (Leicester, 1978), 41–46, 157f., 195. On the issues raised cf. R. K. Harrison, 'Daniel, Book of,' and D. J. A. Clines, 'Darius,' *ISBE*, I, 859–866, 867f.; Ellis, *Old Testament* (note 25), 40–50. See below, note 60.

[58] Cf. Mt 26:31–35 parr; 26:69–75; Lk 22:32.

[59] Jn 6:70f.; 13:10f., 18f., 21–30; Mt 26:21–25 parr; 27:3ff.; Acts 1:15–20.

[60] E.g. Isa 3:8–26; Jer 17:27; 19:13ff.; Ezek 4:1–3; Lk 19:43f.; Mt 24:1–36 parr; cf. Lk 21:20–24; Ellis, *Christ* (note 10), 227–232; idem, *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2002), 289–292, 318f.; Dan 9:26f.; 11:31; 12:11.

events occurred as predicted.[61] Perhaps the most striking juxtaposition and coherence of God's predestination and man's free actions are expressed in Acts 2:23 and 4:27f.:

> This [Jesus], delivered up by the fixed counsel and foreknowledge of God,
> You by lawless hands nailed up [on a cross] and killed.

> [Lord,] Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and peoples of Israel,
> Were gathered together to do
> Whatever things your hand and your counsel
> Predestined (προώρισεν) to be done.

There is a perfect correspondence between acts of free human will and God's actions as

> The one who brings about all things (τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος)
> According to the counsel of his own will.
>
> (Eph 1:11)

God's foreknowledge includes, according to Scripture, not only external events that issue from man's free will, but also every thought in every human heart. Before a thought comes to our mind or a word to our tongues, God knows it completely.[62]

Salvation History and History

God's foreknowledge of particular historical events, as it is expressed in Scripture, pertains to 'salvation history,' that is, those individual and 'connected series of events' that, within the broader course of general history (Cullmann) reveal and unfold the divine plan of redemption in history.[63] Yet it must extend to other events as well since salvation history and general history, although distinct, are inseparably woven together.

[61] II Kg 25:1–12; Josephus, *The Jewish War* 6, 358–442. Cf. Ellis, *Christ* (note 10), 227–233; L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted* (Lund, 1966). Rationalist interpreters reject biblical predictive prophecy, and some seek to disprove it. Their conclusions are determined, however, by their doctrinaire presupposition that the future cannot be known or cannot be revealed. See Ellis, *History* (note 9), 8ff.; above, note 26.

[62] Cf. Ps 139:4–18; 147:5; Dan 2:28f.; Mt 5:1–18. See above, notes 48f.

[63] I.e. beginning with the prophecies concerning Eve and Satan (Gen 3:15) and the call of Abraham (Gen 12:1–3), extending through the Exodus and the election of David (I Sam 16:9–13) and his seed (II Sam 7:12–17), and consummated in the sending, death and

Countless events over countless generations brought about and determined the histories of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Greece and Rome to their points of predicted relationships with the salvation history of Israel.[64]

For our fallen human reason God's foreknowledge and man's free will pose an antinomy, a logical contradiction, and have been topics of much theological discussion.[65] Yet Scripture affirms both. A simple analogy is the two rails of a railroad track, one representing human free will and the other God's predestination. One rail does not influence the other, yet they always remain perfectly parallel. For the railroad there are ties underneath that keep the rails parallel. Perhaps in the future resurrection the theological ties between general predestination and free will will be revealed to us. But for now they are a mystery and, in submission to the prophetic Word, we can only affirm them both. Concerning the divine side Martin Luther put it best:

> God knows nothing contingently….
> He foresees, purposes and does all things
> According to his immutable, eternal and infallible will.[66]

That is, God knows the future because he wills the future.

resurrection of Jesus Christ and of his church (Jn 17:18; Gal 3:16, 29; 4:4; I Cor 15:22f., 45–57). Cf. O. Cullmann, 'Salvation History (Economy of Salvation)' and 'New Testament Salvation History and History,' *Salvation in History* (New York, 1967), 74–78, 150–166.

[64] Admittedly, God could have woven predicted events of salvation history into a random, helter-skelter and chaotic process of general history. But at least two factors weigh against this. God can foreknow all events as easily as the numerous predicted ones, and history is a seamless web in which the most inconsequential events often determine the most consequential results. Therefore, it is difficult logically to avoid the conclusion that God foreknows all events, many of which are the result of the free and responsible purposes and acts of man. See above, notes 49, 63.

[65] Cf. Calvin (note 8), 3, 22, 1f.; Edwards (note 17), 357–371 (Part IV, §4, 5); C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, 1952 [1872]), III, 400f., 545; J. P. Boyce, *Abstract of Systematic Theology* (Philadelphia, 1887), 86–92; A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. in 1 (Philadelphia, 1943 [1907]), I, 284ff. On antinomy in biblical revelation cf. J. I. Packer, *Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God*, 18th edn. (Downers Grove, IL, 1979), 18–36. Cf. Rabbi Akiba in M Aboth 3:15f.

[66] Luther (note 17), 80 = Luther's works, *Weimarer Ausgabe XVIII*, 614–618.

The Finite God of Free Will Theism

In recent years a number of evangelical theologians have promoted a 'free will theism' that, among other things, limits God's foreknowledge. They are rightly concerned to affirm God's living and loving relationship to his creatures; the question is whether they have rightly understood classical theism and whether their new paradigm is a proper key to understanding the biblical teaching about God. They appear to derive their views from a number of theories going back as far as the heretical teacher, Pelagius (†c. AD 419), but to be indebted primarily to process philosophy and theology.

During the Reformation the unitarian Socinus the Younger (1539–1604) argued that the knowledge of God includes all that is knowable but that, since free future acts are uncertain, they are unknowable even to God.[67] Later Unitarians and some hyper-Arminians put similar limits on God's omniscience. In the last century E. S. Brightman, an early advocate of process philosophy, wrote:[68]

> Evolution [is] a basis for belief in a finite God … (127f.)
>
> The only God worth believing in … is a God in living relation to the facts of cosmic and human history … (129)
>
> This points to a God who is in some sense actually developing and growing' (130)[69]
>
> [On this view of God] there would [probably] be a definite surrender … of omniscience, at least as far as foreknowledge is concerned (185)[70]

[67] Cited in Hodge (note 65), I, 545. So also C. H. Pinnock in C. H. Pinnock *et al.* (eds.), *The Openness of God: A Biblical Challenge to the Traditional Understanding of God* (Downers Grove, IL, 1994), 121, 123: 'God knows all things that can be known ….' 'The future … cannot be infallibly anticipated, even by God.'

[68] Cf. E. S. Brightman, *The Problem of God* (New York, 1930). Cf. A. N. Whitehead, 'The Nature of God,' *Religion in the Making* (New York, 1926), 149–158; cf. 105–120; idem, 'God and the World,' *Process and Reality* (New York, 1929), 519–533, 520, 524, cf. 344. But see the critique of R. G. Gruenler, *The Inexhaustible God: Biblical Faith and the Challenge of Process Theism* (Grand Rapids, 1983).

[69] So also Pinnock (note 67), 123f.: '… God learns things ….' 'God is the best learner … because he is completely open to all the input of an unfolding world ….'

[70] So also C. H. Pinnock, 'God Limits His Knowledge,' *Predestination and Free Will*, ed. J. Feinberg *et al.* (Downers Grove, IL, 1986), 157: '[God] knows everything that can be

The philosopher, R. Swinburne,[71] like Socinus, argues that 'God is omniscient in the attenuated sense' (183), i.e. he cannot know future free human action because, if so, the action cannot be free. He seeks support from biblical references that 'God changes his mind;' therefore, 'he cannot have foreknown his own future actions, and so his knowledge cannot be unlimited' (182). But the claim that God would not know of a future change of mind is mere assertion that overlooks the most elementary principle of interpretation: Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture.[72]

Drs. Clark H. Pinnock,[73] Gregory A. Boyd[74] and others, following Socinian, extreme Arminian and recent process thought,[75] also propose a finite God in their 'open God' theology or 'free will theism.'[76] Within the limits of this chapter, I can only mention briefly several problems that I have with their reading of Scripture:

1. Their understanding of 'free will' and of human freedom is not derived from Scripture but from the ideology of the French Revolution. It is the *liberté* of human autonomy that through Thomas Jefferson and others especially pervades the psyché of

known …. But free actions are not entities that can be known ahead of time.' Similarly, G. A. Boyd, *God of the Possible* (Grand Rapids, 2000), 23: 'We hold that God determines (and thus foreknows …) *some*, but not *all*, of the future.'

[71] R. Swinburne, 'The Incompatibility of Omniscience and Free Will,' *The Coherence of Theism*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1993), 172–183.

[72] Even Jonah (4:2) knew that God would change his mind. For anthropomorphisms in biblical language about God cf. the Southwestern dissertation: C. M. Ashley, 'John Calvin's Utilization of the Principle of Accommodation and Its Continuing Significance for an Understanding of Biblical Language,' Ph.D. Diss., SWBTS, Fort Worth, TX, 1972.

[73] Cf. Pinnock (note 67), who says that he seeks 'the middle way' between classical and process theism (192), but whose writing is weighted heavily toward the latter.

[74] Boyd (note 70) and Pinnock cite many others, non-evangelicals among them, who generally agree with their views. But see M. J. Erickson, 'The Doctrine of God,' *The Evangelical Left* (Grand Rapids, 1997), 87–107; I. H. Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided* (Edinburgh, UK and Carlisle, PA, 2000).

[75] For discussions, critique and literature see T. Gray and C. Sinkinson (eds.), *Reconstructing Theology: A Critical Assessment of the Theology of Clark Pinnock* (Carlisle, 2000); C. Pinnock, 'God Limits his Knowledge,' *Predestination* (note 70), 143–179.

[76] The term used by Pinnock and J. H. Haster in Pinnock (note 67), 105, 150. See the comments of Pinnock and Brightman on God's finite foreknowledge, above, notes 67–70; of Pinnock on God's changeableness and limited power, below, notes 87, 88.

many North Americans. According to Scripture this kind of free choice is always egocentric choice and therefore always a manifestation of evil precisely because it is a choice made independently from God. For fallen man there is no neutral willing and no neutral acting because all acts of will proceed from a corporate sphere of sin.[77] For Scripture true freedom is found in slavery to God,[78] in a willingness to do God's will.[79] Free will theism reflects an inadequate view of the presence and the pervasiveness of sin.[80]

2. Similarly, representative free will theists reject as 'incoherent' the recourse to 'antinomy' to explain divine sovereignty and human responsibility in biblical revelation[81] and are confident that human reason is competent to resolve the problem so as to be 'logically coherent'[82] and to meet 'the requirements of intelligence' for skeptics and Christians alike.[83] Is this not exactly the kind of 'worldly wisdom' that Scripture rejects?[84] In its elaborate, not to say rationalizing, dialectics (διαλογισμοί) free will theism appears to reflect the reasoning of the Enlightenment's 'autonomous man,'[85] or what Karl Barth called 'absolute man,'[86] and thus to exalt human reason over divine revelation and to limit God's omniscience.

[77] E.g. Rom 3:9–19; 14:23; Gal 3:22; Eph 2:1–3; II Tim 2:25f.; I Jn 5:19. See above, note 44. For Christ's sake God accepts the mixed motives of the believers, his chosen ones, because they proceed from the corporate sphere of Christ's righteousness. Cf. Ellis, *Pauline Theology* (note 25), 8–17.

[78] E.g. Rom 6:17f., 20, 22.

[79] Jn 7:17.

[80] Cf. G. Bray, *The Personal God* (Carlisle, 1998), 74: 'it seems that the authors of *The Openness of God* [note 67] have not reckoned with the seriousness of human sin.' Cf. also R. K. M. Wright, *No Place for Sovereignty* (Downers Grove, IL, 1996), 112–118.

[81] On antinomy cf. Packer (note 65), 18–36.

[82] R. Rice, *God's Foreknowledge and Man's Free Will*, 2nd edn. (Minneapolis, MN, 1985), 32.

[83] Pinnock (note 70), 144.

[84] Cf. I Cor 1:18–3:20; II Cor 1:12; Ellis, 'The Role of the Prophet in the Quest for Truth,' *Christ* (note 10), 262ff.

[85] Ellis, 'The Syndrome of Rationalism,' *History* (note 9), 8f.

[86] K. Barth, 'Man in the Eighteenth Century,' *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1972), 33–79, 37.

3. The published arguments for the 'open God' of free will theism neglect the biblical teaching on God's transcendence[87] and with 'process God' assumptions distort the teaching on his immanence.[88] They also appear to fuse or to confuse the divine and human natures of Christ.[89]
4. Gregory Boyd, one writer promoting the 'open God,' concedes that God has foreknowledge of some future events but then proceeds to explain this in Pelagian fashion. For example, he suggests that the Lord could predict Peter's denial[90] because he psychoanalyzed him and weighed the statistical probabilities: 'Anyone who knew Peter's character perfectly could have predicted that under certain highly pressured circumstances (that God could easily orchestrate) he would act just the way he did.'[91] His explanation is similar to Pelagius' view that God 'foreknew who would be holy … by the choice of free will, and on that account elected them ….'[92] But in Peter's denial it was, in Boyd's view, a pressured free will.

As far as I can understand it, the biblical analysis of free will theism, driven by its 'process God' ideology, is a special pleading, more witty than weighty. It lacks scope and depth and is a totally inadequate representation of the God of the Bible. Its deity seems to be a God biting his nails and wondering whether and when he can orchestrate a billion autonomous and unknown future actions of his rebellious creatures so as to fulfill his purpose. One might sympathize with

[87] E.g. Eccl 3:11; 7:23f.; Isa 40:28; 55:8f.; Mt 11:27; Rom 11:33.

[88] E.g. Pinnock's (note 67) comments that 'God has rivals and has to struggle with them' (114) and that 'the fall into sin was against the will of God and proves … God does not exercise total control …' (115). Similarly, he tends to equate God's holy love with human sentiment and to turn analogical and anthropomorphic expressions about God in Scripture into a univocal knowledge of his person. See above, note 72.

[89] Pinnock (note 67) opposes 'early theologians [who explain] the incarnation without admitting that God changed' (117). But contrast his statements in Pinnock, note 70: 'God is not immutable in his essence in the sense that he is triune – a dynamo of love and activity' (156n). 'God is unchangeable in essence …, [but] changeable in his knowledge …' (155). Some terms need a clearer definition.

[90] Mt 26:33ff. parr.

[91] Boyd (note 70), 35.

[92] A. Augustin, 'On the Predestination of the Saints,' *NPNF*[1], V, 497–519, 515; cf. V, 226.

such a God. One might even want to help him. But it would be difficult to worship him.[93]

Conclusion

The sovereign God of the Bible loves and cares for all his creatures – from the dinosaurs to the earthworms. And he knows each one perfectly and gives to each its time and season and purpose.[94] For terminally impenitent creatures who are morally responsible, God also shows his love: 'He makes his sun to rise on the evil and on the good and sends rain on the just and on the unjust;'[95] he even allows the demons to go into the swine and preserves them in darkness until their annihilation on Judgment Day.[96] He shows through them his power and his glory and his righteousness and, even in his wrath upon them, God is never less than just.[97]

But God's greatest mercies and unimaginable gifts are given to the redeemed, his chosen ones, whom he has destined to be given his own immortality and holiness and thus 'to become partakers in the divine nature.'[98]

> Blessing and glory and wisdom
> Thanksgiving and honor and power and might
> Be to our God forever and ever. Amen.[99]

[93] In writings supporting free will theism, the relation of the Christian to God is reminiscent of the Cynic-Stoic sage's relation to the deity, more partner than servant and subject. Cf. II Cor 6:18; Rev 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 15:3; 16:7, 14; 19:6, 15; 21:22; see K. H. Rengstorf 'Religious Messengers in Hellenism,' 'ἀπόστολος,' *TDNT* 1 (1964/1933), 412.

[94] 'To everything there is a season and a time for every matter under heaven' (Eccl 3:1); 'One of the sparrows will not fall to the ground without your Father's will' (Mt 10:29); 'God clothes the grass … which today is and tomorrow is thrown into the oven …' (Mt 6:30). Cf. Ps 94:7–11; 104:24–30; 139:1–16.

[95] Mt 5:45.

[96] Mt 8:29ff. parr; II Pet 2:4, 9. Cf. Mt 10:15; 11:22ff.; Acts 17:31; Rom 2:16; cf. Ellis, 'New Testament Teaching on Hell,' *Christ* (note 10), 179–199.

[97] E.g. Rom 2:5; 9:17–24; II Thess 1:5–10; Rev 16:5ff.

[98] II Pet 1:4; cf. e.g. I Cor 2:9; 15:53–57; I Tim 6:16; Mt 5:8; Eph 1:4; I Pet 2:9.

[99] Rev 7:12, NKJV.

2

Paul, Predestined Apostle of Christ Jesus: Whence the Name and the Title?*

The Apostle teaches that God 'set me apart (ἀφορίζειν) from my mother's womb … in order that I might preach [his Son] to the Gentiles.'[1] What God sovereignly determined, he brings to pass in Paul's life and ministry.

Paul's Name

In his letters Paul's name is always Παῦλος. In Acts this name appears first in the episode concerning the proconsul Sergius Paulus (Acts 13:6–12). Previously Saul is used, mostly with a Greek termination (Σαῦλος), but in the (vocative) accounts of Paul's conversion it is a transliterated Hebrew form (Σαούλ; Acts 9:4, 17; 22:7, 13; 26:14).[2] The last usage suggests that Saul was Paul's (second) personal name.

* For Bishop Paul Barnett

1 Gal 1:15f. Similarly, regarding all elect believers, God 'foreknew (προέγνω) and predestined (προώρισεν) …. And whom he predestined, these he also called (ἐκάλεσεν); whom he called these he also justified (ἐδικαίωσεν); whom he justified these he also glorified (ἐδόξασεν)' (Rom 8:29f.). What God has done corporately in the past, he will effect individually, each one as the case may be, in the future. Cf. NKJV, RSV, ESV. On the Greek terms, cf. BDAG, 158, 249, 258, 502ff., 866, 873; T. S. Green, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament*, 27th edn.. (Grand Rapids, 1976), 46, 157.

2 On the Hebrew and Greek usage cf. T. Ilan, 'שאול,' *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Antiquity I* (Tübingen, 2002), 211ff.

According to the book of Acts Paul was a Roman citizen from birth[3] and would have inherited this status from his father or earlier forefather. As such, in addition to his Hebrew name Saul, he had three Roman names. It has been supposed that he was given the name 'Paul' in honor of the conversion of the proconsul, Sergius Paulus (Acts 13:12).[4] More likely, however, 'Paul' was, from birth, his Roman *cognomen*, i.e. personal name, which he began to use regularly at the outset of his own missions to the Gentiles.[5] With its allusion to a distinguished Roman family, the name itself provided an entrée to many circles that he wished to reach with the gospel message. Where and how did he get it?

Roman citizens had at least three names: personal (*praenomen*), clan (*nomen*), and a family or more often an additional personal name or names (*cognomina*). 'Freedmen and enfranchised foreigners took their patron's *praenomen* and *nomen*, adding their original name as a *cognomen*,' e.g. Marcus Tullius Cicero's freedman and secretary, Marcus Tullius Tiro. The enfranchised foreigner's son might also be given the patron's name as a *cognomen*.[6]

Παῦλος very probably did not originate as a Greek usage[7] but was derived from the Roman, i.e. Latin name, Paul(l)us. Lucius Aemilius Paulus, an ancient and distinguished Roman family name, again became prominent in the first century BC[8] and included a quaestor,

[3] Acts 22:25–28; cf. 16:37f. He was also a citizen of Tarsus (Acts 21:39).

[4] So, Jerome, *de virus illustribus* 5:1ff. (*NPNF*[2] III, 362); E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1923), III, 196f.; cf. H. Dessau, 'Der Name des Apostels Paulus,' *Hermes* 45 (1910), 347–368, 363; F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 5 vols. (London, 1920–33), IV (1933), 145f. But see G. A. Harrer, 'Saul Who Also is Called Paul,' *HTR* 33 (1940), 19–33, 28–32.

[5] Cf. J. B. Polhill, *Acts* (Nashville, 1992), 295f.; G. A. Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (Edinburgh, 1903), 313–317; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen* (Grand Rapids, 1960 [1897]), 81–87. Otherwise: Dessau (note 4), 351.

[6] T. J. Cadoux, 'Names, Personal;' E. Badian, 'Tiro,' *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. N. G. L. Hammond *et al.*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 1970), 721, 1078. Cf. Juvenal, *Satires* 5, 127; Harrer (note 4), 21.

[7] A computer search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: CD Rom #D* (Irvine, CA, 1992) (cf. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. Canon of Greek Authors and Works*, ed. L. Berkowitz *et al.* (Oxford, 1990)) disclosed only a Roman or Roman-derivative usage of Παῦλος during this period.

[8] Cf. Suetonius, *Julius Caesar* 29, 1; idem, *Augustus* 19, 1; 64, 1; Hammond (note 6), 791; W. Smith (ed.), *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, 3 vols. (Boston, 1859), III, 153ff.; A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll (eds.), *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Wissenschaft* (Stuttgart, 1893–), 18, 4 (1949), 2362ff.

i.e. financial officer and second in military command in Macedonia (59 BC), a proconsul or governor of the province of Asia (9 BC)[9] and perhaps of the province of Cyprus.[10] The name was also borne by other related Romans, including it seems Sergius Paulus.[11]

In the East Roman Empire citizenship for foreigners began to proliferate only in the first century BC, chiefly during the Second Triumvirate (Antony, Lepidus, Octavian = Augustus) and the following civil war (43–31 BC). It was attained only by individual grants from a military commander or from the Emperor,[12] often with the sponsorship of a proconsul or of another eminent authority.[13]

If, as Jerome states, Paul's parents went (as Roman captives) from Galilee to Tarsus, Roman citizenship could have been granted when Paul's father was freed.[14] But the account is late and legendary, and the evidence appears to place the Roman family Paulus until the first century AD only as far east as the provinces of Macedonia and Asia.[15] According to Rom 16:21, Paul had kinsmen (συγγενεῖς)-co-workers in Macedonia (Jason, Sosipater) and perhaps in Asia (Lucius). One of them, Lucius (Λούκιος), also apparently bore a name from the Paulus family. It is not improbable that Lucius, here given a more formal spelling by Paul's secretary, is the same co-worker who appears elsewhere in Paul's letters as Luke (Λουκᾶς).[16]

Paul's forefather probably was not enfranchised in Tarsus. If he lived earlier in Greece or in the province of Asia, he could have been

[9] Cf. Hammond (note 6), 427, 792. Cf. also Harrer (note 4), 27n.

[10] Cf. Jackson and Lake (note 4), V, 456f.

[11] Acts 13:7. Cf. Tacitus, *Histories* 4, 13, 1; R. Riesner, *Paul's Early Period* (Grand Rapids, 1998), 138–142, 416.

[12] A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, 1980), 273, 294f., 306–311.

[13] E.g. Pliny, *Letters* 10, 5; 10, 6; 10, 11 (c. AD 99).

[14] So, T. Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament,* 3 vols. (Minneapolis, 1977 [3rd edn.., 1909]), I, 69f. = GT: (Wuppertal, 1994), I, 49; cf. Jerome, *ad Philemon*. 23; idem, *de viris illustribus* 5.

[15] See above, notes 9 and 10. Cf. Philo, *ad Gaium* 155ff.

[16] Col 4:14; II Tim 4:11; Plm 24. Cf. Rom 16:21 with Acts 16:10–17 ('we'); 17:5–9; 20:4; E. E. Ellis, 'Paul and his Co-Workers,' *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*, 5th edn.. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 3–22; idem, 'Paul and his Coworkers,' *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, ed. G. F. Hawthorne *et al.* (Downers Grove, IL, 1993), 183–189, 186; idem, 'Paul and his Coworkers Revisited,' *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*, 2nd edn.. (Atlanta, 2006), 85, 92f.

sponsored there for citizenship by an official or proconsul from the Paulus family. If so, it suggests that the citizenship of Paul's family went back at least two generations. In such a case both Paulus and Lucius could be *cognomina* taken from the family's Roman patron. This offers a better, if also speculative, explanation of Paul's name which, in full, may have been Λούκιος Αἰμίλιος Παῦλος ὁ καὶ Σαούλ.[17]

Paul's Title: ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ

As an 'apostle of Christ Jesus,' Paul is a prime example of God's sovereignty in salvation and of his predestination: He was, like Jeremiah (1:5) and John the Baptist (Lk 1:15), called from his mother's womb (Gal 1:15). The term 'apostle' is closely related to the verb form ἀποστέλλειν = 'to send.' 'Applied to a person, it denotes more than ἄγγελος [i.e. "messenger"]. The "Apostle" is not only the messenger, but the delegate of the one who sends him. He is entrusted with a mission, has powers conferred upon him.'[18] The word is found occasionally in classical and Hellenistic Greek writings but with little significance for New Testament usage.[19] Three possible sources of the New Testament concept of apostle have been given considerable attention: (1) Cynic-Stoic philosophy, (2) the Gnostic movement and (3) the Jewish institution of the commissioned representative.

The closest formal conceptual parallel, although not using the term ἀπόστολος, is the self-perception of the Cynic philosopher as one whom 'God has sent' (ἀπέσταλκεν) to be 'the messenger, the scout (κατασκόπος) and the proclaimer of the gods,' who becomes the

[17] Cf. Harrer (note 4), 33. Further, cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., 7th edn.. (Edinburgh, 1998), I, 48ff.

[18] J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (Peabody, MA, 1994 [12th edn.., 1896; 1st edn.., 1865]), 92.

[19] Usually related to sea voyages, it may designate such things as an envoy (Herodotus, *History* 1, 21), an embassy (Herodotus, *History* 5, 38) a naval expedition (Demosthenes, *Orator* 18, 80; cf. 3, 5), colonists (Dionysius Halicarnassus, *Roman History* 9, 59, 2), a military envoy (cf. *Anecdota Graeca*, 3 vols., ed. I. Bekker (Graz, 1965 [1814]), I, 217, lines 26f.). Cf. K. H. Rengstorf, 'ἀπόστολος,' *TDNT* 1 (1964/1933), 407–445, 407f.: Unlike the New Testament, there is no institution nor authorization of the ἀπόστολος in pagan Greek usage, only the quality of being sent.

instructor of men.[20] On the other hand, the Cynic-Stoic philosophy 'was always a human program … [in which] the accent is still laid on human initiative and human judgment.' '[While the Cynic] belongs to the deity as ὑπηρέτης ["assistant"], he is never absolutely dependent on it as δοῦλος ["slave"]; he rather stands alongside it …. Hence the relationship of the messenger to the deity … is more like an agreement between two partners.'[21] Consequently, the Cynic-Stoic sage, although exhibiting formal similarities, is essentially quite different from the New Testament conception of ἀπόστολος.

A second possible source, which received some attention in the mid-twentieth century by members of the Bultmann school, is the use of the term ἀπόστολος in later Gnostic writings and the attribution of early Christian usage to a Gnostic origin.[22] This viewpoint rests on the assumption, against the New Testament evidence, that the conception and usage of 'apostle' was not present in Jesus' earthly ministry nor in the primitive Jerusalem church but that it arose among Christian missionaries in Antioch who, in turn, had borrowed it from a pre-Christian 'Gnostic' usage. The later Gnosticism was thought to reflect, in this respect, an earlier prototype.[23] The Gnostic movement, however, is known only from Christian writings and from Gnostic texts that are later than and mostly dependent on New Testament documents;[24] there is no clear

[20] Epictetus (AD 50–130), *Discourses* 3, 22, 46; 3, 22, 69. Cf. Rengstorf (note 19), 399, 409–413, 410; W. Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church* (Nashville, 1969), 111–114, 111 = GT: 100–103, 100.

[21] Rengstorf (note 19), 412.

[22] E.g. Schmithals (note 20), 92–95, 114–230 = GT: 81–84, 103–216. For a summary of the thesis and its advocates cf. F. H. Agnew, 'The Origin of the New Testament Apostle-Concept: A Review of the Research,' *JBL* 105 (1986), 75–96, 85–90.

[23] Schmithals (note 20), 88–95, 92, 115, 147f., 181 = GT: 77–84, 81, 104f., 136, 168f., passim, who, writing within the Baur tradition and largely following the classical form criticism, exhibits an unwarranted skepticism toward the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (see below, note 49). He argues that 'the only primitive Christian concept of the apostle …, namely the Pauline one, has nothing to do with the *schaliach*.' That is, he thinks that the authority of the *shaliaḥ* and of the apostle differ, and he identifies the nature of the *shaliaḥ*'s office with the kind of tasks given. But the relationship between the two figures was to be found in a comparison of their formal elements and not, as Schmithals thought, in their phenomenological characteristics. Also, 'it is the relationship between sender and sent, not the content of the commission given, that is primarily important' in the *shaliaḥ* convention (Agnew, note 22, 81).

[24] Gnostic cults created and/or interpolated apocryphal Gospels attributed to apostles of Christ, e.g. the Gospel according to pseudo-Philip, the Gospel according to pseudo-Thomas. Cf. B. Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures* (New York, 1995), 325–353, 376–399;

evidence for a pre-Christian Gnosticism.[25] The hypothesis was basically an imaginative construct supported by relatively little contemporary historical data and that rather dubious.

A third and the most probable hypothesis[26] is that ἀπόστολος in New Testament usage has its primary background in the Hebrew concept of the שׁל יח = *shaliaḥ*.[27] Its verbal form שׁל ח ('to send') was employed occasionally in the Old Testament with a juridical connotation with reference to men sent by the king on a particular mission,

M. L. Turner, *The Gospel According to Philip* (Leiden, 1996); R. McL. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip* (New York, 1962); B. Gärtner, *The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas* (London, 1961). According to Eusebius (c. AD 260–340), the creation of false apostles is imputed to Gnostic cults by Hegesippus (c. AD 150; *HE* 4, 22, 6) and by Dionysius of Corinth (c. AD 170; *HE* 4, 23, 12). Cf. also Tertullian, *de Praescr. Haer.* 30, 13; *de carne Christi* 2, 15.

[25] So, S. Petrement, *A Separate God: The Christian Origins of Gnosticism* (San Francisco, 1990), 1–26: 'the principal myths and characteristics of Gnosticism can be understood on the basis of Christianity, …' (26); similarly, A. H. B. Logan, *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy* (Edinburgh, 1996), 19–23; C. B. Smith II, *No Longer Jews: The Search for Gnostic Origins* (Peabody, MA, 2004), 244–252; see also E. M. Yamauchi, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism* (Grand Rapids, 1973), 21–28, 161f., 163–186: 'The Reitzenstein-Bultmann hypothesis of a pre-Christian Gnosticism is "a house of cards", (184). Cf. R. McL. Wilson, *Gnosis and the New Testament* (Oxford, 1968), 1–30, 140–145: 'Christianity emerged on the stage of history in much the same period [as Gnosticism]' (144). Otherwise: K. Rudolph, *Gnosis* (Edinburgh, 1983), 275–308, who appears to incorporate a variety of antecedent pre-Christian motifs under 'Gnosis.'

[26] First advanced, apparently, by John Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae: A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraicae*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids, 1979 [1658]), II, 176, on Mt 10:1, and argued in the nineteenth century by Joseph B. Lightfoot, 'The name and office of an Apostle' (note 18), 92–101.

[27] Although juridical in its origins, this would not have excluded religious connotations since, unlike the modern period, in antiquity there was no separation between 'secular' and religious categories. On the connotations of the term cf. Agnew (note 22), 93f.; C. K. Barrett, '*Shaliaḥ* and Apostle,' *Donum Gentilicium. FS D. Daube*, ed. E. Bammel (Oxford, 1978), 88–102; J. A. Bühner, 'ἀπόστολος' *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, 3 vols., ed. H. Balz *et al.* (Grand Rapids, 1993), I, 142–146. The concept has similarities with and differences from the Roman law *de mandato* (Barrett) and the modern law of agency. Cf. Gaius, *Institutes* III, §155–162; Justinian, *Institutes* III, §26; E. Poste, *Institutes of Roman Law by Gaius*, 4th edn.., tr. and ed. E. A. Whittuck (London, 1925), 378ff., 381–386; J. B. Moyle, *Imperatoris Justiniani Institutionum*, 5th edn.. (Oxford, 1912), 449–455; H. F. Lusk, 'Agency,' *Business Law*, 4th edn.. (Chicago, IL, 1951), 282–374: 'When the principal is disclosed and the business is transacted in his name, the principal is bound if the agent is acting within the scope of his authority' (305); H. C. Black, *Black's Law Dictionary*, 5th edn.. (St. Paul, MN, 1979), 58: 'Agency is the fiduciary relationship which results from the manifestation of consent by one person to another that the other shall act on his behalf and subject to his control, and consent by the other so to act.'

e.g. ambassadors.[28] This older practice apparently broadened into the more general sense of a commissioned agent or representative, and in I Kg 14:6f. it has a religious connotation; there the prophet is sent (שׁל וח) by God to King Jereboam's wife with bad news for the king.[29] This verbal employment of שׁל ח for the sending of a commissioned agent, including the implication of the principal in the actions of his agent, also appears in the Qumran literature:[30]

> He shall send out (ישׁל ח) no stranger
> On his business on the sabbath day.
>
> No man shall send (ישׁל ח) to the altar any burnt offering …
> By the hand of one smitten with any uncleanness …
> Permitting him thus to defile the altar.
>
> (CD-A 11:2, 18ff. Vermes (c. 50 BC))

The term (and cognates) in rabbinic writings pointed to an established convention for a commissioned representative from the late second-century AD and was doubtless so utilized at the time of the ministries of Jesus and of Paul.[31] The rabbinic *shaliaḥ,* within the scope of his commission, was viewed as standing in the shoes of the principal:

> A man's agent (*shaliaḥ*) is as himself.[32]

[28] II Sam 10:2–5; I Sam 25:39–42. Cf. K. H. Rengstorf, *Apostolate and Ministry* (St. Louis, MO, 1969), 26: Although employing the verb form שׁל ח, 'the [Old Testament] existence of the institution itself is attested with absolute certainty.' Further, Rengstorf (note 19), I, 414. Cf. H. Volgelstein, 'The Development of the Apostolate in Judaism and Its Transformation in Christianity,' *Hebrew Union College Annual* 2 (1925), 99–123: the institution of the apostle (שׁל יח) existed as early as I–II Chronicles (99). Cf. Ezra 7:14; II Chron 17:7.

[29] Here the Greek rendering (I Kg = III Kgdm 14:6 LXX A; Aquila) of the verb form שׁל וח = *shaluaḥ* is the substantive ἀπόστολος; so also Isa 18:2 Symmachus. Cf. E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, 2nd edn.. (Grand Rapids, 1998), 145. Cf. Justin, *Dial.* 75:3: 'Isaiah (6:8, שׁל חני) shows that those prophets who are sent (ἀποστελλόμενοι) … from God are called his angels and apostles' (ἀπόστολοι).

[30] Although the substantive שׁל יח apparently is not present in the DSS.

[31] Cf. Barrett (note 27), 96 ('probably'); E. Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im Neuen Testament* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1993 [1951]), 61: 'In the New Testament period the *shaliaḥ* institution in Judaism is in any case known everywhere.'

[32] M Berakoth 5:5 and Mek *Pisḥa* 3, middle, on Exod 12:3; cf. M Rosh Hashanah 4:9; M Gittin 4:1; (H. L. Strack and) P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 4 vols. in 5 (Munich, 1922–28), III, 2ff.

That is, 'in anything that [the agent] says and does in accordance with his commission, to a certain extent embodies the one who sent him.'[33] Thus, the *shaliaḥ* could effect the betrothal (M Kiddushin 3:1) or divorce (M Gittin 4:1) of the principal and could serve as a substitute in religious ceremonies (M Rosh Hashanah 4:9). Even the high priest in his temple duties is a *shaliaḥ* of the Sanhedrin.[34]

But is the Hebrew term *shaliaḥ* in the rabbinic writings equivalent to the biblical Greek term ἀπόστολος? The occasional Greek Old Testament use of ἀπόστολος represents a translation not of the Hebrew noun *shaliaḥ* but of the verb *shalaḥ*. The rabbis, however, do employ the *shaliaḥ* convention in ways similar or equivalent to relationships and activities attributed to Jewish ἀπόστολοι by patristic writers. For example, they speak of *shaluḥin*, i.e. commissioned agents going out from Jerusalem to inform diaspora Jews of the day assigned as the New Moon so that they 'might know the exact days of the festivals.'[35] They attest to the antiquity of the custom by the additional comment, 'And while the Temple still stood they went forth also …,'[36] and by a saying attributed to Rabban Gamaliel:[37] 'The agent (שׁל יח) of the congregation fulfills the obligation that rests upon the many.'[38]

Christian writers speak similarly of Jewish ἀπόστολοι. The earliest reference occurs in a tradition, cited by Eusebius[39] and probably dating from the second century:[40] 'In the writings of the ancients we

[33] Rengstorf (note 28), 26.

[34] M Yoma 1:5. So, P. Blackman, ed., *Mishnayoth*, 7 vols., 2nd edn.. (New York, 1963), II, 275n.

[35] Blackman (note 34), II, 383, on M Rosh Hashanah 1:3.

[36] M Rosh Hashanah 1:3. Thus the reference reflects the period before the destruction of the Temple in AD 70, viewed perhaps from a century or more later.

[37] Either Paul's teacher, Gamaliel I (fl. AD 10–40; cf. Acts 5:34; 22:3) or his grandson, Gamaliel II (fl. AD 75–100).

[38] M Rosh Hashanah 4:9. Also, M Yoma 1:5; see above, note 34.

[39] In his commentary on Isa 18:1f. Cf. ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ΕΛΗΝΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ, ed. B. M. Bellas *et al.* (Athens, 1955–), 23 (1960), 80f. = MPG 24 (1857), 215f. For an informative discussion of the patristic evidence on Christian missionaries, including Christian and Jewish apostles, cf. A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, 2 vols., 2nd edn.., tr. J. Moffatt (New York, 1908), I, 319–368 = GT: (4th edn.., Leipzig, 1965 [1924]), 332–379. Further, cf. S. Krauss, 'Die jüdischen Apostel,' *JQR* 17 (1905), 370–383.

[40] Judging from the similar comments, although not using the term 'apostles,' in Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho a Jew* 17:1 (c. AD 150): 'You selected and sent out (ἐξεπέμψατε)

find that the [Jewish] priests and elders … resident at Jerusalem drew up and dispatched (διεπέμψαντο) written instructions for the Jews throughout every country …. Their apostles (ἀπόστολοι) also swarmed everywhere on earth calumniating the gospel of our Saviour. And even at the present day it is still the custom of the Jews to give the name of "apostle" to those who convey encyclical epistles from their rulers.'[41] Similar comments are made by other fourth-century Christian writers.[42]

Although the tasks of the rabbinic *shaliaḥ* differed from those of the New Testament apostle, it is not the particular task[43] but the relationship of the sender and the one sent that defines and characterizes the institution of the *shaliaḥ*. That relationship is the determinative factor in deciding whether the New Testament concept of apostle has its background and origin in the Old Testament and Jewish institution.

In the New Testament the term 'ἀπόστολος'('one sent'), like the Hebrew *shaliaḥ*, is the substantive of the verb 'ἀποστέλλειν' ('to send forth') = the Hebrew *shalaḥ*. It designates primarily two types of ministry defined by the principal, i.e. the one who commissions the apostle. (1) The designation 'apostle of Christ Jesus' or its equivalent pertains to one commissioned directly by Jesus Christ; (2) the 'apostle of the church(es)' designates one commissioned by one or more churches, e.g. as a delegate or missionary.[44] The first designation, which is our present concern, is frequently ascribed and

chosen men from Jerusalem into all the earth (πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν) to tell that a godless heresy of the Christians had sprung up and to publish things … against us.' Cf. also A. L. Williams, *Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho* (London, 1930), 35.

[41] Translation of Eusebius by Harnack (note 39), I, 59n. Also, M Rosh Hashanah 1:3; see above, note 35.

[42] E.g. Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30, 11, 1ff. (Williams): 'Judas, the partriarch, … awarded [Josephus] the revenue of the apostolate (ἀποστολῆς). He was sent (ἀπόστέλλεται) to Cilicia with a commission, and … collected the tithes and firstfruits from the Jews of the province …. (He was) very solemn … and immaculate, as apostles (ἀπόστολος) are ….' 'And he purged and demoted many of the appointed synagogue-leaders, priests, elders ….' Cf. F. Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 3 vols. (Leiden, 1994); J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1914), I, 405.

[43] *Pace* Barrett (note 27), 97. See above, note 23.

[44] See Rom 16:7; II Cor 8:23; Phil 2:25. On Rom 16:7 cf. E. E. Ellis, *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society*, 5th edn.. (Eugene, OR, 2005), 66.

applied by Paul to himself.[45] It finds its significance in the modifier 'Christ Jesus,' and is defined by Paul in terms of those who 'have seen' the risen Lord[46] and, therefore, have been commissioned by him.[47]

During Jesus' earthly ministry the term 'apostle' is applied only to those pupils whom Jesus sent out on mission. It is to these that Jesus speaks the words: [48]

> He who hears you hears me
> He who rejects you rejects me.
>
> (Lk 10:16)

In this framework the 'apostle of Jesus Christ,' then, is his authorized representative, bears his message and within the scope of the commission carries his authority, even as an ambassador carries the authority of his head of state.

The same conception also underlies Paul's comments about his own person and about his message:

> You received me
> As the messenger of God, as Christ Jesus.
>
> (Gal 4:14)

> When you received the Word of God, which you heard from us
> You received it not as a word of men
> But as it truly is, the Word of God.
>
> (I Thess 2:13)

[45] I Cor 1:1; II Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1; Eph 1:1; Col 1:1; I Tim 1:1; II Tim 1:1; Tit 1:1; cf. Rom 1:1. Acts 14:4, 14 also probably refers to apostle of Jesus Christ since Luke–Acts uses the term 'apostle' only in this sense.

[46] I Cor 9:1; 15:5–8.

[47] The risen Jesus appeared, i.e. revealed himself, only to those whom he commissioned, including Paul. Cf. Gal 1:1, 15f; Acts 9:15f.; 22:21; 26:17. See also I Cor 15:3–8 (implied); Acts 10:40f.; cf. Mt 28:16–20; Lk 24:30–35 (implied), 46ff.; Jn 20:21, 26–29 (implied); 21:15ff. Even the women at the tomb were given a (limited) commission (Mt 28:9f.; Jn 20:16ff.).

[48] The saying is placed within the episode of the mission of the Seventy (Lk 10:1–20, or perhaps 10:1–24), whose apostolic status is implied by their 'commissioning' (ἀνέδειξεν) and 'sending' (ἀπέστειλεν, 10:1). A similar saying in Matthew is also in the context of sending out the Twelve apostles (Mt 10:1f., 5, 40; 11:1). Cf. Jn 13:20. Cf. E. E. Ellis, 'A Special Note on the Apostles and the Twelve,' *The Gospel of Luke*, 8th edn.. (Eugene, OR, 2003 [2nd edn.., 1974]), 132–135.

> If anyone thinks that he is a prophet or a pneumatic
> Let him recognize that what things I am writing to you
> Are a command of the Lord.
>
> (I Cor 14:37)

The relationship between Jesus and his apostles, both those sent out on mission during his earthly ministry[49] and those commissioned and sent out after his resurrection,[50] is remarkably close to that between the principal and the agent in the Old Testament and in the Jewish institution or convention of the *shaliaḥ*. It is, therefore, highly probable that the New Testament apostle represents the messianic Jewish, i.e. the Christian form of that institution.[51]

Among the gifts, i.e. charisms, of ministry apostleship is first.[52] And it apparently encompasses, in Paul's understanding, all other charisms from the Holy Spirit – e.g. prophecy,[53] ministry,[54] administration,[55] miracles,[56] speaking in tongues (γλώσσαις λαλεῖν).[57]

As those personally commissioned by the risen Jesus, apostles of Jesus Christ were eyewitnesses to the fact of his resurrection; this

[49] Mt 10:1–16, Mk 3:13–19, 6:7–13, 30, Lk 6:12–16, 9:1–6, 12 (Twelve); Lk 10:1–20 (Seventy). On the origin and transmission of Gospel traditions cf. E. E. Ellis, 'From Traditions to the New Testament,' *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, 2nd edn.. (Leiden, 2002), 19–47.

[50] See above, note 47.

[51] Lightfoot (note 18), 92–101; Harnack (note 39); Billerbeck (note 32), III, 2ff.; Rengstorf (note 19).

[52] I Cor 12:28 ('first'); cf. 12:4 (χαρίσματα); Eph 4:11. Of course, a commissioned apostleship was appointed by Jesus before the general outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. See E. E. Ellis, 'Reading the Gospels as History,' *Christ and the Future in New Testament History*, 2nd edn.. (Leiden, 2001), 252.

[53] I Cor 14:14, 18f., 37. It may also be inferred from references and instructions concerning prophecy that Paul gives elsewhere (Rom 12:6; 13:2, 9; 14:1–5, 39; I Thess 5:20; I Tim 1:18; cf. 4:14 with II Tim 1:6). Cf. Acts 13:1.

[54] I.e. as διδάσκαλος, κῆρυξ ('teacher,' 'preacher,' I Tim 2:7; II Tim 1:11) and διάκονος ('minister,' I Cor 3:5–15; II Cor 3:6; 6:4; Col 1:23ff.), which included gifts of teaching and preaching. See Ellis, *History* (note 16), 87f., 94ff.; idem, 'Paul and his Co-Workers,' *Prophecy* (note 16), 5–13.

[55] To be inferred from references and instructions that Paul gives, including piloting (κυβέρνησις, I Cor 12:28) and shepherding (ποιμαίνειν, ποιμήν, I Cor 9:7; Eph 4:11; cf. Acts 20:28) and overseeing (ἐπισκοπεῖν, ἐπισκοπήν, ἐπίσκοπος, Phil 1:1; I Tim 3:1f.; Tit 1:7; cf. Acts 1:26; I Pet 5:2) = eldership (πρεσβύτερος, πρεσβυτέριον, I Tim 4:14; 5:17ff.; Tit 1:5–9; cf. Acts 14:23; 15:2–6, 22f.; Jas 5:14; I Pet 5:1f.; II Jn 1; III Jn 1).

[56] II Cor 12:12. Cf. P. Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, 1997), 579–582. See below, note 65.

[57] I Cor 14:18f.; cf. 14:37. See below, note 62.

witness and its implications are the content of their message and are derivative from as well as a part of their apostleship. The apostles also exemplified *par excellence* the 'cruciform' (cf. I Cor 1:23; 2:2) and rejected character of Christ in the conduct of their ministry[58] although this *imitatio Christi* is, by Jesus' own command,[59] incumbent upon all believers and is not unique to the ministry and gift of 'apostle.'[60]

It is as an apostle, that is, an *apostolic* prophet, of Jesus Christ that Paul distinguishes his ministry from that of other prophets, whose messages are subject to evaluation or judgment (διακρίνειν, διακρίσις) by other gifted individuals:[61]

> … Am I not an apostle? … This is my answer to those
> Who are calling me to account (τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρίνουσιν)[62]

> For me it is of least concern that I should be judged (ἀνακριθῶ) by you ….
> The one who judges me (ὁ ἀνακρίνων μέ) is the Lord.[63]

The prophet is never the (sole) judge of his own message. But the apostle of Jesus Christ, like an ambassador, is always so and is subject only to the judgment of the one who commissioned him.

The 'signs' of an apostle[64] are mentioned by Paul along with his extraordinary experience of being caught up into the 'third heaven,'

[58] I Cor 4:8–13; II Cor 4:7–12; 6:4–10; 11:23–30; Col 1:24; cf. Phil 3:8–11; Acts 5:41; 9:16; Lk 4:28f.; 9:58 par; 13:34 Q. See Ellis, '"Christ Crucified,"' *Prophecy* (note 54), 72–80.

[59] E.g. Mt 10:22; Lk 9:23 T + Q; Jn 15:18–21. Cf. Ellis (note 48), 139ff.

[60] E.g. Rom 8:17; Phil 1:29; I Thess 1:6; 2:14; II Thess 1:5f.; II Tim 3:12; Rev 2:10. See I Cor 4:16; 11:1: 'Become imitators of me, as I am of Christ.' Cf. I Thess 1:6; II Thess 3:7ff. Somewhat differently, A. C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, 2000), 66f., and the literature cited.

[61] I Cor 14:29; cf. 12:10.

[62] I Cor 9:1–3. Within the larger circle of 'charismatic' gifts (χαπίσματα) there is a smaller circle of charisms of inspired speech and discernment, the 'spiritual' gifts (πνευματικά) of the pneumatics. See Ellis, '"Spiritual" Gifts in the Pauline Community,' *Prophecy* (note 16), 24–30.

[63] I Cor 4:3f.

[64] Cf. Barnett (note 56), 579 ff.; M. E. Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 2000), II, 837–841: 'The plain sense of ["signs of an apostle"] is … that [Paul] has performed miracles in Corinth … as authenticating signs of his apostleship.' Otherwise: Thiselton (note 60), 64–67, and the literature cited.

presumably into the council of Yahweh,[65] and they are set in contrast to the 'weaknesses' of his rhetorical abilities or interests.[66]

Finally, as a *shaliaḥ*, the apostle cannot transfer his role or his authority to another.[67] This has implications for the doctrine of apostolic succession that cannot be entered into here.

[65] II Cor 12:2f., 12. Cf. R. N. Whybray, *The Heavenly Counselor in Isaiah xl 13–14* (Cambridge, 1971), 39–48, and the literature cited. *Pace* Whybray, the Council of Yahweh is not represented only as an 'idea' or 'concept' but also as the vision-experience of a number of prophets. Cf. I Kg 22:19–23; Isa 6:1–8; Jer 23:18; H. W. Robinson, 'The Council of Yahweh,' *JTS* 45 (1944), 151–157.

[66] See A. D. Litfin, *Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric* (Cambridge, 1994). Somewhat differently, A. Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (Stockholm, 1998), 35ff.

[67] Otherwise: F. A. Sullivan, *From Apostles to Bishops* (New York, 2001), 217–230; G. Dix, 'The Ministry in the Early Church,' *The Apostolic Ministry*, ed. K. E. Kirk (London, 1946), 183–303, 228–232, 260f., who asks, 'Could His *shelihim* acting in His Person transmit to others the *personal* commission received from Him? If this were impossible, what was to become of the "apostolic" office in the church' (261)? The answer would appear to be that the apostolic office continues in the apostolic teaching, i.e. in the New Testament. There is no evidence that apostleship was transmitted to or through bishops. Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry* (London, 1948), 31–52: The 'relation between Jesus and the Twelve corresponds admirably to the relation between a principal and his *sheluchim* in Jewish usage' (46.). '[It] was a personal thing and inalienable. It would be forfeited by misconduct; but it could not be transmitted to another. It did not pass at death' (51). Further cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 6th edn.. (Peabody, MA, 1994 [1885]), 95–99, 181–269; H. W. Beyer, 'ἐπίσκοπος κτλ.' *TDNT* 2 (1964/1935), 599–622, 615–630. See also B. M. Merkle, 'The Elder and the Overseer: One Office in the Early Church,' Louisville, KY: Ph.D. Diss. SBTS, 2000, 160–189; R. A. Campbell, *The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity* (Edinburgh, 1994).

3

Colossians 1:12–20
Christus Creator, Christus Salvator

This chapter is designed as a study in the formation of an exposition of Scripture that, among other things, sets forth, especially at Col 1:13 and in the subsequent Col 1:21ff., with great clarity God's sovereign initiative and efficacious action in salvation. Prerequisite to a good expository sermon is a study of the historical background and literary structure of the particular biblical text. In that light the inspired teaching of the passage will be best received and expounded.

The Historical Setting of Colossians

The letter 'to the holy and faithful brothers[1] in Christ at Colossae' is attributed to 'Paul, apostle of Christ Jesus … and Timothy the

[1] This probable translation of τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἁγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (Col 1:2, Moule) indicates that the letter's immediate recipients are Paul's co-workers, i.e. the brothers (Ellis), who are then to read and explain it to the whole congregation. Cf. Col 3:16; 4:16; C. F. D. Moule, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 3rd edn.. (Cambridge, 1962), 45f.; E. E. Ellis, 'Paul and his Co-Workers Revisited,' *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*, 2nd edn.. (Atlanta, 2006); idem, 'Paul and his Co-Workers,' *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*, 5th edn.. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 17f. The precise translation of the masculine gender and the occasional generic masculines in the essay reflect my theological understanding and a commitment to hear and to read the text within its historical and theological meaning.

brother,' i.e. co-worker.[2] In accordance with good historical method one 'tests the genuineness and demonstrates the non-genuineness' of one's sources.[3] Colossians is attested as Paul's letter in the canon of Marcion[4] at about AD 140[5] and was being cited as such in the later second century by writers from Gaul,[6] Italy,[7] North Africa[8] and Egypt.[9] Its genuineness was never questioned in the patristic period, but in F. C. Baur's nineteenth-century Hegelian reconstruction of early Christianity[10] Colossians was rejected on internal grounds. It was declared to be pseudo-Pauline because it reflected 'the period of Gnosticism,' which in Baur's view began only in the second century,[11] and because it had a vocabulary, style and theological themes different from the letters that Baur accepted.[12] The first objection was short-lived since gnosticizing elements were shown to be present[13] in the false teaching opposed by first-century Christian writers.

2 Cf. M. Barth and H. Blanke, *Colossians* (New York, 1994), 138f.; Ellis, *Prophecy* (note 1), 17f.

3 E. Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (New York, 1970 [1914]), 332.

4 Tertullian, *Against Marcion* 5, 19; cf. Tertullian, *Adversum Marcionem*, ed. E. Evans (Oxford, 1972), 629–637, 646. Cf. J. Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (Chicago, 1942), 40.

5 So, A. von Harnack, *Marcion* (Durham, NC, 1990), 17f. = GT: 25–29, cf. 121*–124* (Harnack's reconstruction of Marcion's mutilated text of Colossians).

6 Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3,14,1 (c. AD 180).

7 The Muratorian Canon (c. AD 170). Cf. D. J. Theron, *Evidence of Tradition* (Grand Rapids, 1958), 106–113.

8 Tertullian, *Prescription against Heretics* 7, middle (c. AD 200).

9 Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1, 1, end (c. AD 194).

10 F. C. Baur, 'Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde…,' *TZT* 1831: IV, 61–206, 76, 136, 205f. = idem, *Ausgewählte Werke*, 5 vols., Stuttgart 1963–75, I, 1–46, 16, 76, 145f. Cf. E. E. Ellis, *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, 2nd edn.. (Leiden, 2002), 441f.

11 F. C. Baur, *Paul*, 2 vols. in 1, 2nd edn.. (Peabody, MA, 2003 [1845]), II, 7–32 = GT: II, 11–36. Baur (II, 35 = GT: II, 39) followed E. T. Mayerhoff, and he gave less attention to differences of style and vocabulary. But others who accepted Baur's conclusions about authorship have increasingly relied on these factors. Cf. W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 14th edn.. (Nashville, TN, 1975), 340ff.

12 Baur (note 11, II, 106–111 = GT: II, 116–122) regarded as genuine only four Pauline letters – Romans, I–II Corinthians, Galatians. A. Hilgenfeld (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament* [Leipzig, 1875], 236–247, 328–348), a member of Baur's school, extended the genuine letters to include Philippians, I Thessalonians and Philemon. These seven letters are those 'undisputed' by contemporary followers of the Baur tradition.

13 E.g. by J. B. Lightfoot, 'The Colossian Heresy,' *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 11th edn.. (Grand Rapids, 1974 [2nd edn.., 1879]), 73–113, whose views

Objections to Paul's authorship on the basis of a vocabulary, style, and theology absent from the Apostle's earlier letters continued throughout the twentieth century.[14] But they were undermined, if not discredited, by two decisive developments in the research: the recognition of the role of the secretary[15] and the identification of numerous preformed traditions, many non-Pauline, in virtually all of Paul's letters.[16] The Apostle of necessity used a secretary, and preformed traditions in Colossians total at least 42 percent of the letter.[17] In the light of these developments there are today no adequate reasons, literary or historical, for rejecting the attributed authorship when the author of the letter is recognized to be not necessarily one who penned it or who dictated it verbatim but one under whose direction and authority the letter was composed and sent.[18]

Colossians is one of five prison letters of Paul.[19] Imprisonment was used in the Roman world not as a punishment but only for disorderly conduct, protective custody and detention for trial or for

received striking confirmation with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Cf. P. Benoit, 'Qumran and the New Testament,' *Paul and Qumran*, ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor (London, 1968), 16f.; E. E. Ellis, 'The Opposition Common to the [Apostolic] Missions,' *Making* (note 10), 314–318; idem, 'Paul and his Opponents,' *Prophecy* (note 1), 80–101, 112f.; P. T. O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon* (Waco, TX, 1982), xxx–xxxviii.

[14] E.g. V. P. Furnish, 'Colossians,' *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols., ed. D. N. Freedman (New York, 1992), I, 1092ff.; cf. E. Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon* (Philadelphia, 1971), 90f., 181ff. = GT: 138ff., 255ff. But see G. E. Cannon, *The Use of Traditional Materials in Colossians* (Macon, GA, 1983), 175ff., 196–229. Also affirming the genuineness of Colossians and recognizing 'the weight of traditional materials' in it are Barth and Blanke (note 2), 64–72, 114–126. Cf. also O'Brien (note 13), xli–xlix.

[15] Otto Roller, *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe* (Stuttgart, 1933), 17–20; E. R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (Tübingen, 1991), 23–67, who show that the secretary in antiquity often influenced the vocabulary and style of a letter, even to the extent of becoming the co-author of it. Cf. Ellis (note 10), 115n, 305n, 326f.

[16] Cf. Ellis (note 10), 69–117, 139, 407–418, and the literature cited; for Colossians cf. Barth and Blanke (note 2), 64–72; Cannon (note 14), 11–49 (confessions and hymns), 54–65, 82–94 (vice and virtue lists), 95–131 (household code), who concludes that Colossians is so permeated with traditional materials that literary analysis 'has little value in determining authorship' (177).

[17] Cf. Ellis (note 10), 108–111, 116f., 326f.

[18] Cf. Barth and Blanke (note 2), 72: '… the test of an author's originality and creativity lies not in the scarce or abundant endorsements of other people's words, formulations, and ideas, but in what he makes of given materials.'

[19] Cf. Eph 6:20; Phil 1:10, 13, 17; Col 4:3, 18; II Tim 1:8, 2:9; Plm 9, 23.

execution.[20] Such detentions known to us in the Apostle's ministry that were long enough for writing letters were one in Caesarea, Palestine (AD 58–60), and two in Rome (AD 61–63 and 67–?68).[21]

Colossians, along with Ephesians and Philemon, was very likely composed and sent from Caesarea[22] although traditionally it has been given a Roman provenance during Paul's first imprisonment there.[23] Favoring Caesarea are (1) Paul's plans to go to Spain (Rom 15:24), later qualified to fit in an intervening visit to Colossae (Plm 22); the qualifier is quite compatible with an overland journey from Caesarea after his expected release from prison there, but it is difficult to understand if the visit were undertaken from Rome, over 1,000 miles to the west of Colossae. The plans to go to Spain were not canceled at Rome but, as the evidence shows,[24] were carried out.

(2) If Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon were carried to the recipients at the same time by Tychicus, as is probable, the absence of Onesimus from the circular letter of Ephesians is understandable on a westward overland journey from Caesarea: Onesimus was left at Colossae (Plm 10ff.; cf. Col 4:9). It is passing strange on an eastward journey from Rome.[25] (3) The mention of several of the same co-workers both in the letters and in Paul's collection visit to

[20] Ellis (note 10), 267ff. It was used domestically as a punishment for slaves.

[21] Acts 23:23f.; 24:27; 28:16, 30; II Tim 1:8, 16f.; 4:6ff. Cf. I Clem 5:7; *Apocryphal Acts of Paul* 11:1–5 (*NTA*, II, 213–270); Ellis (note 10), 267f., 283f. But see II Cor 11:23. A detention in Ephesus has been inferred from I Cor 15:32, but the 'beasts' there very probably refer to Paul's opponents. See Ellis (note 10), 268f.; A. C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, 2000), 1251f.; G. D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, 1987), 700f.; A. Robertson and A. Plummer, *First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh, 1963 [2nd edn.., 1914]), 361f. For the (unsuccessful) hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment cf. G. S. Duncan, *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* (London, 1929), 66–123, 111–114.

[22] Ellis (note 10), 266–275, and the literature cited; cf. Kümmel (note 11), 346ff.; B. Reicke, 'The Historical Setting of Colossians,' *RE* 70 (1973), 429–438; already, H. A. W. Meyer, *Philippians and Colossians and … Philemon* (New York, 1885), 198; idem, *Epistle to the Ephesians* (New York, 1884 [3rd edn.., 1859]), 299ff.

[23] E.g. Codices A B1 K P (subscript); cf. O'Brien (note 13), l–li.

[24] I Clem 5:6f.; *Acts of Peter (Vercelli)* I, 1–3 (*NTA*, II, 287–311); Muratorian Canon, middle; cf. Ellis (note 10), 278–283; idem, '"The End of the Earth" (Acts 1:8),' *History* (note 1), 53–63; Theron (note 7), 110.

[25] Cf. Eph 6:21; Col 4:7. Going east, Colossae would come after Ephesus.

Jerusalem, preceding the Caesarean imprisonment, also supports a Caesarean provenance for the letters.[26] (4) The number of preformed traditions in Ephesians and Colossians that have a Semitic–Greek idiom and style[27] are a secondary support for a Caesarean provenance although they would, of course, be fully compatible also with a Pauline letter from Rome.[28]

The Literary Form of Col 1:12–20

The passage incorporates a confession (1:12ff.) and a following hymn (1:15–20). That the confession goes with the hymn and not with the preceding prayer (1:9–11c)[29] is supported by two indicators: (1) There is an opening imperatival participle, μετὰ χαρᾶς εὐχαριστοῦντες (1:12), which in common Jewish usage began a confessional statement.[30] (2) The change from the second to the first person plural, although not unusual in Paul's writings, points to a shift from the Apostle's intercession for the Colossians (1:9ff.) to a common thanksgiving of the church (1:12ff.):[31]

12 With joy giving thanks to the Father
Who made us fit for a share of the appointed lot of the saints in light
13 Who delivered us from the power of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of his beloved Son
14 In whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.

[26] I.e. Aristarchus, Luke, Timothy, Tychicus. Cf. Acts 20:4, 6 ('we'); Eph 6:21; Col 1:1; 4:7, 14; Plm 1, 24; Ellis (note 10), 271–275. Only Luke and Aristarchus accompanied Paul to Rome (Acts 27:1f.).

[27] E.g. Eph 1:3–14; 4:25–5:14; Col 1:12–20; 3:18–4:1. Cf. Ellis (note 10), 105–110, and the literature cited. See below, notes 30, 35, 61, 62.

[28] E.g. Phil 2:6–11; cf. Ellis (note 10), 275ff.; idem, 'Preformed Traditions and Their Implications for the Origins of Pauline Christology,' *History* (note 1), 133–150.

[29] So, Lohse (note 14), 34 = GT: 68f.; R. P. Martin, *Colossians and Philemon* (London, 1974), 53; Cannon (note 14), 12–19; cf. E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Darmstadt, 1956 [1913]), 250–254. Otherwise and traditionally: O'Brien (note 13), 18f.; Barth and Blanke (note 2), 172f.; J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Grand Rapids, 1996), 67f.; Lightfoot (note 13), 140.

[30] Cf. Lohse (note 14), 34f. = GT: 68f.; D. Daube, 'Participle and Imperative in I Peter,' in E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 3rd edn.. (Grand Rapids, 1981 [1947]), 467–488, 471–480. The editors of the Greek text place the phrase 'with joy' in verse eleven.

[31] Col 1:12, ἡμᾶς A C D F G *M* lat sy bo, 13; 1:14, ἔχομεν. The ὑμᾶς at 1:12 ℵ B is, then, probably an assimilation to 1:9 (ὑμῶν).

The thanksgiving opens with a participial clause introducing three relative clauses. This liturgical and poetic style, suited to congregational usage,[32] and the words and idiom unusual or unique in Paul's letters[33] make probable that this is a preformed non-Pauline piece employed in the worship of Paul's churches before the Apostle incorporated it into his letter. Col 1:13b–14 marks a transition from the work of the Father (1:12–14) to the cosmic and redemptive work of the Son, *Christus Creator* and *Christus Salvator* (1:15–20).[34]

The literary form of 1:15–20 also has the markers of poetic structure, that is, 'the typical distinguishing features of the (oriental) hymnic style ….'[35] It contains three major divisions: The middle stanza opens with the emphatic αὐτός (1:17); the first and last begin with relative clauses (1:15, 18b: ὅς ἐστιν), each followed by two causal clauses (1:16, 19: ὅτι) that are elaborated in a rhythmic succession of phrases:[36]

15 Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) before all creation[37]

[32] Cf. Cannon (note 14), 14f.; Norden (note 29), 250–254.

[33] E.g. κλῆρος ('lot'); ἀπολύτρωσις identified here and in the preformed hymn at Eph 1:3–14 as 'the forgiveness of sins;' the phrases 'saints in light,' and 'kingdom of his beloved Son.' Cf. Lohse (note 14), 32f., 39; Ellis (note 10), 107f.; Cannon (note 14), 15; Norden (note 29).

[34] Cf. Meyer, *Philippians and Colossians* (note 22), 233. It may be that Paul himself coupled the two pieces when he composed the letter.

[35] Barth and Blanke (note 2), 228, first detailed, apparently, by Eduard Norden (note 29), 141–276, 380–387, 250–254. Further, cf. R. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit* (Göttingen, 1967), 143–155; K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (Gütersloh, 1972), 170–180; J. N. Aletti, *Colossiens 1, 15–20* (Rome, 1981); M. E. Gordley, *The Colossian Hymn in Context* (Tübingen, 2007).

[36] Cf. Norden (note 29), 252ff.; Cannon (note 14), 20. For literature on the passage cf. M. Wolter, *Der Brief an die Kolosser. Der Brief an Philemon* (Gütersloh, 1993), 70f.

[37] The preposition 'before' is required both by the subsequent assertion that 'all things have been created through him' (Col 1:16d) and by the meaning of πρωτότοκος. Cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids, 1984), 58f.; Lohse (note 14), 44, 46, 48f. = GT: 82, 84f., 87f.; Lightfoot (note 13), 146–150, 154f. Otherwise: Dunn (note 29), 88f., 91. On πρωτότοκος cf. Barth and Blanke (note 2), 246ff.

16 Because in him all things were created in the heavens and on the earth
The visible and the invisible
Whether thrones or lordships
Or rulerships or authorities.
All things have been created through him and for him.
17 And he is before all things
And all things subsist in him
18 And he is the head of the body, the church.
Who is the beginning, the firstborn from out of the dead bodies (νεκρῶν)
In order that he might continue to be first (γένηται πρωτεύων) in all things
19 Because *it* pleased *the Father for* all the fulness to dwell in him
20 And through him to reconcile all things to himself[38]
Having made peace through the blood of his cross
Through him, whether the things on the earth
or the things in the heavens.

Whether or not the hymn has been slightly reworked to fit it more closely to the concerns of the letter,[39] it generally reflects a preformed character.[40] Its similarities with an earlier non-Pauline preformed passage, I Cor 8:6,[41] as well as the presence of vocabulary[42] and idiom[43] unusual or unexampled in the Pauline letters, argue also that this hymn was not created by the Apostle Paul.[44] It was clearly

[38] Reading αὐτόν = ἑαυτόν and referring to God the Father. Cf. Bruce (note 37), 74n.

[39] E.g. perhaps adding Col 1:18. Cf. the repetition of certain key words of Col 1:18 in Col 1:22, 24; 2:11, 17ff. (σῶμα); 1:24 (ἐκκλησία); 2:10, 19 (κεφαλή).

[40] Col 1:15–20 is a distinct and independent pericope, moving from a thanksgiving to the Father (Col 1:12–14) to a hymn to the Son (1:15–20), from the first person (1:12–14) to the third (1:15–20). Col 1:21f. shifts to the second person (introduced by the Pauline idiom, 'then … but now,' ποτέ … νυνὶ δέ cf. Gal 4:8f.; Rom 6:21f.; 11:30) and from the cosmic perspective of the hymn to the interpretation and application of it to the Colossians. Cf. Ellis (note 10), 108f.

[41] Like I Cor 8:6, Col 1:16f. presents the Son as one 'through whom and for whom all things have been created' (16) and reconciled (20). Cf. Ellis (note 10), 87–90; idem, 'Preformed Traditions and their Implications for the Origins of Pauline Christology,' *History* (note 1), 133–150. But contrast Rom 11:36.

[42] I.e. the hapaxes ὁρατός (16), θρόνος (16), πρωτεύειν (18), ἀρχή (18, as a title for Christ), ἀποκαταλλάσσειν (20, except in another non-Pauline preformed piece, Eph 2:16), εἰρηνοποιεῖν (20). Cf. Ellis (note 10), 105f., 108f.; Lohse (note 14), 42 = GT: 78f.

[43] E.g. 'the visible and the invisible' (16), 'blood of his cross' (20). Cf. Lohse (note 14), 42 = GT: 78f.

[44] So, Wolter (note 36), 71f.; Lohse (note 14), 41f.; Bruce (note 37); Martin (note 29), 65. Otherwise: S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, 2nd edn.. (Tübingen, 1984), 144–149; Dunn (note 29), 84ff.; Moule (note 1), 60ff. Of course, the hymn *becomes* Pauline in that the Apostle incorporates (reworks) and affirms it in his letter.

composed by a highly gifted pneumatic, most probably an apostle of Jesus Christ, within the Pauline mission or in an allied mission.[45] In the light of affinities with I Cor 8:6, it may have been used in Pauline congregations before the Apostle's detention in Caesarea although a Caesarean provenance for the hymn cannot be excluded.

The Teaching of Col 1:12–20

An expository sermon on Col 1:12–20 could not expound every teaching in the text (and should not attempt to). Using a traditional three-point outline, plus an introduction and conclusion, it can bring out important aspects of the Apostle's teaching. Supplemented with illustrations at appropriate intervals, it can apply the passage to the theological instruction and to the practical needs of the particular congregation.

Each preacher will choose aspects of the passage that he (or she) wishes to include in the sermon, and each will find illustrations suitable to them. The following will summarize, without illustrations, teachings of the passage that to my mind are significant and that fit into a unified theme for exposition and for preaching.

Introduction

In Col 1:12–20 the Apostle Paul combines a thanksgiving to God the Father (1:12–14) with a hymn to the Son (1:15–20) to teach their respective roles in the deliverance and redemption, that is, the salvation[46] of those who have been brought to faith in Christ (1:4, ἐν Χριστῷ) and who have continued steadfast in their faith toward Christ (2:5, εἰς Χριστόν). He presents the Father as the one who has, already in the past, accomplished this salvation and the Son, who is the visible 'image of the invisible God' (1:15), as the one through

[45] See below, p. 43. Cf. Ellis (note 10), 311–314; idem, *History* (note 1), 138–141. Hypotheses of a pre-Christian or non-Christian origin of (parts of) the hymn are not convincing since they fail to show that Paul's more likely sources, i.e. Christian pneumatics, could not have produced it. 'Preformed' does not necessarily nor ordinarily mean 'pre-Pauline.' Some writers are prone to confuse the two terms.

[46] The term 'salvation' (σωτηρία) does not appear in Colossians, but it encompasses both the terms 'to deliver' (1:13, ῥύεσθαι) and 'redemption' (1:14, ἀπολύτρωσις). Cf. Lk 1:71; Acts 7:25; Mt 1:21; Acts 2:38ff.

whom God the Father has brought it to pass.[47] But how is this deliverance and redemption already a present reality and how does it remain future? What is the nature of the Son, that is, Jesus Christ, that qualifies him to be the mediator of the Father's act of salvation? Let us see how the passage before us deals with these questions.

God's Gracious Action of Salvation (Col 1:12–14)

The saving action of God presupposes that man has need of it. That need is central to Paul's teaching and is expressed elsewhere in terms of the condition of the whole human race as it is descended from our first parents, Adam and Eve, and as our race exists 'in Adam:' 'All in Adam die and all in Christ shall be made alive.'[48] More explicitly, Paul teaches that,

> Just as through one man sin entered into the world
> And death through sin
> So also death came upon all men
> Because[49] all had sinned.'[50]
> … For just as through the disobedience of one man
> The many were constituted sinners
> So also through the obedience of one *man*
> The many will be constituted righteous.[51]

[47] The Holy Spirit appears in Col 1:8, where the fruit of the Spirit, i.e. love, is expressed as 'your love in the Spirit.' Cf. Gal 5:22. But He is not in view in the present passage.

[48] I Cor 15:22. This translation reflects what the next verse, I Cor 15:23, makes clear: The 'all' in Adam is not identical with the 'all' in Christ.

[49] The phrase ἐφ' ᾧ was taken as a relative and in the Old Latin text and in Jerome's Latin Vulgate was translated 'in quo' = 'in whom' (cf. B. Fischer *et al.* (eds.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatum Versionem*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1969)). Augustin used this translation to support the doctrine of original sin. It is probably better translated as a causal conjunction, as it is in Phil 3:12; cf. 4:10, but also as in those passages the past tense of the verb of the subordinate clause (ἥμαρτον) is antecedent to the past-tense action of the main verb (διῆλθεν). Consequently, although Augustin (or rather the Latin translation) probably mistook the force of the ἐφ' ᾧ, he was correct in expounding the text to teach original sin, i.e. that all men had sinned in Adam's act. See below, note 50.

[50] I.e. in the Garden. On the use of the aorist for the English pluperfect cf. E. de W. Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (Grand Rapids, 1976 [3rd edn..,1898]), 22–28. Further, note the discussion and the literature cited in D. A. Sapp, 'An Introduction to Adam Christology in Paul [Rom 5:12–21],' Diss. SWBTS, Fort Worth, TX, 1990, 225–231: '[A pluperfect sense] is the required meaning when [as in Rom 5:12d] the subordinate clause denotes an action antecedent to the past action of the main clause' (228).

[51] Rom 5:12, 19. Just as the all in Adam are not identical with the all in Christ (I Cor 15:22), so also the many constituted sinners are not identical with the many constituted righteous (cf. Rom 5:17).

That is, Paul declares that all, that is, 'the many' who belong to Adam by descent, are condemned to death for his sin because they all existed corporately in Adam,[52] all participated corporately in that sin and all corporately died in Adam (Gen 3:19; I Cor 15:22).[53] In the following verses of Rom 6 he says similarly that 'God's chosen ones' (Rom 8:33; Col 3:12), those who 'by grace through faith' belong to Christ, were also corporately put to death with Christ in AD 33:[54]

> Our old man [Adam] was crucified with him ….
>
> So also reckon yourselves to be dead in *the sphere of* sin
> And living with God in Christ Jesus.[55]

This past corporate participation of believers in Christ's AD 33 death and resurrection, particularly in his resurrection, Paul expresses more fully in Eph 2:5f.:

> [God] made us alive together with Christ (συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ) …
> And raised us up with him
> And made us sit with him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus.

[52] This corporate solidarity in Adam's sin and in Christ's righteousness is best understood in terms of the corporate nature of their persons. Cf. E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 6th edn.. (Eugene, OR, 2003 [1957]), 58ff.; idem, 'Corporate Personality,' *The Old Testament in Early Christianity*, 3rd edn.. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 110–116, and the literature cited; idem, 'The Corporate Dimension of Human Existence,' *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society*, 5th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2005), 8–17; idem, 'The Believer's Corporate Existence in Christ,' *Christ and the Future in New Testament History*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2001), 148–164, 171ff.; S. Aaron Son, *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology* (Roma, 2001), and the literature cited.

[53] Eph 2:5; Rom 3:22ff.

[54] Cf. also Gal 2:19f.; Rom 7:4: 'You were put to death *by God* (ἐθανατώθητε) in the sphere of the law through the body of Christ ….' The passive very probably implies a reference to God. Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols., 7th edn. (Edinburgh, 1998), 335f.; T. R. Schreiner, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, 1998), 349f.; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans*, 2 vols. (Dallas, TX, 1988), 361f.; J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of Paul* (London, 1895), 301. That is, the penalty of God's law has been executed on Christ's individual and corporate body.

[55] Rom 6:6, 11, bringing out the force of the dative-locative. Cf. Ellis, *Pauline Theology* (note 52), 12f.

It is expressed even more sweepingly in Rom 8:29–30:

> For those whom [God] foreknew
> He also predestined *to be* conformed to the image of his Son …
> And whom [God] predestined, these he also called
> And whom he called, these he also justified
> And whom he justified, these he also glorified.

Col 1:12–14 sets forth the same present eschatology, but it does this not, as in Rom 5–8 and in Eph 2, in terms of a corporate inclusion of all God's chosen ones in Christ's death, resurrection and exaltation in AD 33 but in terms of an individual incorporation into him at one's conversion.[56] It proclaims a deliverance from the sphere of darkness and a transference into the domain of the kingdom of his beloved Son (1:13) as a three-fold act of God the Father: God made us fit or worthy; he rescued us, and he transferred us into Christ's kingdom.[57] In God's gracious purpose the individual actualization, although temporally separated, does not exclude the prior corporate reality. Nor is the prior corporate reality independent of the later individual actualization. Both are complementary parts of one inseparable whole whose fulfillment is as certain as the character and the word of God himself.

In the realm of Christ's kingdom, that is, 'in Christ' (1:14, ἐν ᾧ),[58] believers now possess the redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις). This redemption implies, as we have seen above, a previous bondage from which they have been ransomed,[59] and it is strikingly apparent in, although it is not limited to, the forgiveness of sins.

[56] So, O'Brien (note 13), 27. Cf. Rom 8:1.

[57] Already, H. Alford, *The Greek Testament*, 4 vols., 3rd edn. (London, 1856–61), III, 192. Cf. Lohse (note 14), 36 = GT: 72; O'Brien (note 13), 27f.

[58] For the demonstration of the locative force of this idiom cf. A. Deissmann, *Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu,'* Marburg 1892.

[59] So, B. B. Warfield, 'The New Testament Terminology of Redemption,' *The Person and Work of Christ* (Philadelphia, 1950), 429–475, 440ff.; L. Morris, 'Redemption,' *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, 3rd edn. (Grand Rapids, 1956), 9–59, 37–48. Otherwise: D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (Cambridge, 1967), 49–81, 73ff.; F. Büchsel, 'ἀπολύτρωσις,' *TDNT* 4 (1967/1942), 351–356, 354f. That ἀπολύτρωσις has at least the implication of a paid ransom (Morris, Warfield) and not only a liberation (Büchsel, Hill) must be left for another discussion.

'Redemption' also involves a sharp contrast and spiritual conflict expressed elsewhere[60] as a deeply Jewish ethical dualism between darkness and light, a dualism that is perhaps most dramatically elaborated in the Qumran tractate 1QM on the war of the sons of light against the sons of darkness.[61] The redemption that is now corporately a present reality points to an individual actualization in 'the redemption of our bodies' at the future resurrection of the dead and in the life of the world to come.[62] But who is the One through whom and for whom God the Father has accomplished this great redemption? Who is the Son into whose kingdom believers have been incorporated? A hymn to Christ in the next six verses addresses these questions.

Christ: The Head of Creation, the Head of the Church (Col 1:15–20)

This is a stupendous hymn to the person and work of Christ. With reference to his person it presents him as 'the image of the invisible God'[63] and the 'firstborn' (πρωτότοκος) who is 'prior to and supreme over' the whole creation.[64] The term 'firstborn' can have both connotations as well as the meaning 'the first in a series'. It was given the latter interpretation, that is, Christ as the first creature, by the Arians in the fourth century[65] and is given the same interpretation by Jehovah's Witnesses today. But it cannot have that significance in Col 1:15 since the hymn goes on to teach that 'he is before all

[60] Mt 4:16; 6:23; Rom 2:19; 13:12; II Cor 4:6; 6:14; Eph 5:8; 6:12; I Pet 2:9; I Jn 1:5–8; cf. Lk 16:8; II Pet 2:17.

[61] 1QS 3:13, 20f.; 1QM 1:1; 13:5, 10ff., passim. Cf. F. G. Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (Leiden, 1994); idem and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1997); Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford, 1962); K. G. Kuhn, 'The Epistle to the Ephesians in the Light of the Qumran Texts,' *Paul and Qumran*, ed. J. Murphy–O'Connor (London, 1968), 115–131 = GT: *NTS* 7 (1960–61), 334–346. Otherwise: H. Conzelmann, 'φως,' *TDNT* 9 (1974), 325f., 347f.

[62] Cf. Rom 8:23; I Cor 15:42–49.

[63] Col 1:15; cf. Rom 8:29.

[64] Col 1:15. Cf. Moule (note 1), 64f.; see above, note 37.

[65] Cf. B. Lonergan, *The Way to Nicea* (Philadelphia, 1976), 68–87; *ODCC*, 99f. ('Arianism').

things' (1:17) and that 'all things,' that is, the whole creation, was created 'in him,' 'through him' and 'for him' (1:16). The hymn gives this staggering ascription to a man who had been ignominiously executed about twenty-five years before Colossians was composed, and it had been used even earlier in the congregations of the Pauline and probably of other apostolic missions.[66] What was the basis and background for an early Christian pneumatic to compose such an exalted acclamation to Jesus and for the Apostle Paul to affirm it and to include it in his letter to the Colossians?

The primary basis for the ascriptions given to Christ in Col 1:15–19 was in all likelihood the author's own experience of the resurrected Lord. It was this that according to John's Gospel evoked from the skeptical Apostle Thomas the confession, 'my Lord and my God,'[67] that prompted the Apostle John to call Jesus 'the only begotten God'[68] and that caused the Apostle Paul to refer on occasion to Christ as 'God over all things, blessed forever,'[69] as 'our great God and Savior Jesus Christ'[70] and as 'the image of God,'[71] and to regularly apply to Christ Old Testament passages referring to Yahweh.[72] The conscious recognition among the apostles of Christ that their Lord was indeed the incarnate manifestation of Yahweh came as an explosive revelatory experience in his resurrection appearances; it was not a slowly developing idea. It was brought to literary expression over time as they expounded the Old Testament in the light of that revelation. For Col 1:15–17 it involved an application to Christ of Old Testament teachings on divine wisdom.

[66] On the preformed non-Pauline character of the piece see above, notes 40–44.

[67] Jn 20:24–28. Cf. H. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids, 1997), 647f.

[68] Jn 1:18. Cf. B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to John*, 2 vols. in 1 (Grand Rapids, 1980 [1908]), I, 28, 66ff.; Otherwise: Ridderbos (note 67), 58f.

[69] Rom 9:5. Cf. Cranfield (note 54), 464–470. Otherwise: E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids, 1980), 259f. = GT, 1st edn., 247f.

[70] Tit 2:13. Cf. I. H. Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Edinburgh, 1999), 279–282.

[71] II Cor 4:4. Cf. Kim (note 44), 229–233, passim.

[72] E.g. Rom 10:9, 13; II Cor 3:16ff.; Phil 2:9ff. Cf. D. B. Capes, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology* (Tübingen, 1992).

The 'history of religions' school,[73] apparently, led some to speak of 'wisdom' christology in Col 1:15–20 as rooted in 'Hellenistic' Judaism against 'Palestinian' Judaism. But this geographical dichotomy has, in fact, no historical basis. In both Palestine and the diaspora some Jews were 'Hellenists,' that is, lax in their observance of the ritual Law, and some were 'Hebraists' = 'the circumcision party,' that is, strictly observant.[74] But after more than three hundred years under Greek culture, all Judaism was conceptually influenced in some measure and form by Greek thought: 'From the third century BC … a new world of ideas forced its way into the complex of Jewish wisdom,' especially in the areas of anthropology, soteriology and eschatology.[75]

The hymn in Col 1:15–20 is utilized by Paul to present Christ as the hypostasis of the divine wisdom in whom, through whom and for whom the whole universe was brought into being. It does this, as do other New Testament writings,[76] by interpreting the Old Testament creation and fall passages[77] christologically. In this case it does so by interpreting the creation accounts of Genesis by the eulogy to a personified divine wisdom in Pv 8:22–31.[78] The hymn

[73] E.g. W. Bousset, *Kurios Christos* (Nashville, TN, 1970 [1913]), 31–60 = GT: 1–26, passim, who had an Enlightenment, essentially Epicurean, world-view as a confessional presupposition, had to explain how a human and non-miraculous Jesus that fitted his world-view could become the divine/human figure presented in the New Testament. He used, among other things, an alleged dichotomy between 'Palestinian' and 'Hellenistic' Judaism to create his revisionist history.

[74] E.g. Acts 6:1; cf. Ellis (note 10), 287f., 315; idem, 'The Circumcision Party and the Early Christian Mission,' *Prophecy* (note 1), 116–128. Somewhat differently: O. Cullmann, 'The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity,' *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (New York, 1957), 25–32.

[75] Rudolf Meyer, 'Φαρισαῖος,' *TDNT* 9 (1974), 11–35, 21; idem, 'Σαδδουκαῖος,' 'σάρξ' *TDNT* 7 (1971), 35–54, 46, 117ff.; E. Sjöberg, 'πνεῦμα,' *TDNT* 6 (1968), 377ff., showed the influence of Hellenistic conceptions on even the strictest Judaism of the period. Cf. D. Daube, *New Testament Judaism* (Berkeley, 2000), 5 = DCW, II, 5: Col 1:15–18 'is good rabbinic doctrine – once it is granted that Jesus is the Messiah.'

[76] Lk 3:38; 23:43; Jn 1:1–5; Rom 5:12–21; I Cor 11:7ff.; 15:22, 45; II Cor 11:3; I Tim 2:8–3:1a; Heb 1:2. Cf. I Cor 1:24.

[77] E.g. Gen 1–3; Ps 8:3–8; 33:6; Pv 8:22–31.

[78] So, C. F. Burney, 'Christ as the APXH of Creation,' *JTS* 27 (1925–26), 160–177; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 4th edn. (London, 1980), 150ff., 172; cf. N. T. Wright, 'Poetry and Theology in Colossians 1. 15–20,' *NTS* 86 (1990), 455–458. But see Barth and Blanke (note 2), 238f.; Lohse (note 14), 46f. = GT: 85, whose own preference for a 'Hellenistic,' i.e. diaspora Jewish background, also has problems (see above, note 75).

may also reflect descriptions of God's wisdom that had come to expression in other biblical interpretations and in elaborations of intertestamental Judaism.[79] In this way it set forth a christological interpretation of Old Testament thought that both countered and transformed Greek conceptions of divine wisdom (σοφία/חכמה).[80] In this respect Col 1:15–20 is similar to the midrash on Gen 1:1–5 in the Prologue of the Gospel of John that also offered a christological alternative to Stoic conceptions of the divine word (λόγος/דבר).[81] What Stoic philosophy ascribed to a kind of pantheistic divine wisdom, Paul by this hymn attributes to Jesus Christ, both as the creator of the present world and also as the supreme head, the beginning (ἀρχή, 1:18),[82] of the world to come.

The section's final chord (1:20) returns to the soteriological theme of its opening (1:12–14).[83] It again presents God the Father as the initiator and the Son as his agent 'to reconcile all things' (ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα).[84] The reconciliation that removes the hostility and pacifies the enmity between God and his rebellious creatures has two aspects and produces two outcomes. The first aspect is that man in his sin, in his egocentrism is hostile toward

[79] E.g. Ben Sira = Sirach = Ecclesiasticus 1:4, 9; 24:1–7; Wisdom 7:27; Philo, *On the Sacrifices of Abel and Cain* 8 (III); *Allegorical Interpretation* I, 43 (on Gen 2:8): The 'heavenly wisdom is of many names; for [Moses] calls it "beginning" and "image" and "vision of God"….' Cf. Ellis, '"Wisdom" and "Knowledge" in I Corinthians,' *Prophecy* (note 1), 48f.; idem (note 10), 88ff.

[80] Cf. U. Wilckins, 'σοφία,' *TDNT* 7 (1971), 473: '[The Stoic ideal of] σοφία as knowledge is the διάθεσις ["disposition"] which corresponds to the λόγος that constitutes the unity of the cosmos, ….' The Stoic Emperor Marcus Aurelius (AD 161–180) so speaks of the cosmos: 'From you are all things, in you are all things, for you are all things' (*Meditations* 4, 23).

[81] Jn 1:1–5. Cf. Ellis (note 10), 166f.

[82] In the Greek Old Testament and in the New Testament ἀρχή may denote supremacy or temporal priority. In Col 1:18 it appears to include both aspects. Cf. G. Delling, 'ἀρχη,' *TDNT* (1964/1933), 481–484.

[83] Cf. Lohse (note 14), 61 = GT: 103: The 'right understanding of the cosmological statements of the first part of the hymn is disclosed only by the soteriological statements of the second strophe [of the hymn].'

[84] The term, perhaps the preference of Paul's secretary, occurs in the New Testament only at Col 1:20f.; Eph 2:16. But the cognate, καταλλάσσειν, is used by Paul in Rom 5:10; I Cor 7:11; II Cor 5:18ff.

God; and the second is that God in his fixed and righteous wrath toward all evil is hostile toward sinners.[85] Yet God in his love for sinners has taken the initiative to effect a reconciliation.

To 'reconcile' an enemy means to remove the hostile situation. For those who persist in rebellion against God, the hostility will be removed by their own death.[86] But for elect believers, God's chosen ones, it was removed, from God's side, by 'the blood of his cross' (1:20) in which Christ paid the death penalty for sin;[87] from the human side the reconciliation is accomplished and is still being accomplished by the gospel proclamation through which man is brought back into a loving and righteous relationship with God. Col 1:12–20 is intended to celebrate this gracious redemption and the glorious possessions and prospects of the people of God.

[85] Cf. J. Stott, *The Cross of Christ* (Leicester, 1986), 195–202, 197f.

[86] Cf. Ellis, 'New Testament Teaching on Hell,' *Christ* (note 52), 179–199, 180n. E.g. Rom 2:8f.; 6:23; Phil 3:18f.; II Thess 1:7ff.; 2:8–11.

[87] Cf. Morris, 'Reconciliation' (note 59), 186–223.

4

Perspectives on Biblical Interpretation

God's sovereignty extends beyond the salvation of the individual to the history of salvation itself and to the interpretation of God's Word of salvation, i.e. of the Holy Scriptures. Biblical interpretation, which for the modern period means historical, critical, literary, theological interpretation,[1] is the part of salvation-history in which the Holy Spirit sovereignly reveals to God's people, in His own time and purpose and persons, the true meaning of the various teachings of Holy Scripture.[2] A prominent example is Martin Luther's interpretation of Rom 1:17.

To offer perspectives on contemporary interpretations among biblical writers poses a number of problems. (1) It is difficult, first of all, to identify those issues that are currently of significant scholarly interest for discussion and debate. (2) It is also not easy to determine which questions to engage in detail and which to treat in brief.

The following study uses a recent *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*[3] as a framework for selecting the topics, for inter-

[1] E. E. Ellis, 'Historical-Literary Criticism – After Two Hundred Years,' *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*, 2nd edn. (Atlanta, 2006), 1–16.

[2] E. E. Ellis, 'The Role of the Prophet in the Quest for Truth,' *Christ and the Future in New Testament History*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2001), 255–278.

[3] John H. Hayes (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, 2 vols. (Nashville, TN, 1999). References to articles are listed simply to volume and page numbers.

action with them and critique of them. As such, it is both a review essay and an analysis of the items addressed. Following a literary-historical-critical method, it critiques certain other approaches found in some *Dictionary* articles. It also concentrates attention on matters that seem to be most important for advancing the discipline. Whether the selections and interpretations do so is left for the reader to decide.

Among its most valuable features, the *Dictionary* offers numerous biographical sketches of individuals who have contributed to the interpretation of the Scripture in various times, places and manners.[4] In these brief essays alone it offers readers an education about the course of historical developments in biblical studies, an education that is very substantial even if a few names raise an eyebrow and some are overlooked that another editor might have included.[5]

A second profitable feature and a major element of the work is the history of interpretation of each biblical book[6] and of the intertestamental Apocrypha. The emphasis on the patristic, Reformation or modern periods and on particular issues and representative figures varies with the interests of each contributor. But they are generally judicious choices although the understandable focus on twentieth-century developments sometimes unduly shortens the discussion of earlier stages of interpretation.

The *Dictionary* also includes valuable pieces on ancillary disciplines, e.g. 'Archeology and Biblical Studies,' 'Assyriology and Biblical Studies.'[7] It has essays on some early Jewish and early Christian fictional, pseudepigraphal and other writings;[8] on ancient

[4] From Clement of Rome and Ignatius to W. D. Davies and W. G. Kümmel.

[5] I missed G. C. Aalders, O. T. Allis, Matthew Black, Edward Burton, Jean Carmignac, Hans Conzelmann, Patrick Fairbairn, F. L. Godet, R. K. Harrison, G. E. Ladd, J. P. Lange, Otto Michel, K. H. Rengstorf, A. T. Robertson, Georg Strecker, W. C. van Unnik, E. J. Young. See further, D. K. McKim, *Historical Handbook of Major Biblical Interpreters* (Downers Grove, IL, 1998); for thirty-five evangelical Protestant scholars, cf. W. A. Elwell *et al.* (eds.), *Bible Interpreters of the Twentieth Century* (Grand Rapids, 1999).

[6] Some books are combined, e.g. I–II Samuel, I–II Kings, Ezra–Nehemiah, and some essays are dedicated to biblical segments, e.g. Pentateuch, Sermon on the Mount.

[7] Also, articles on Egyptology and Ugarit. Further, cf. W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atrahasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford, 1969).

[8] E.g. Jubilees, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, II–IV Baruch, III–IV Maccabees, Sibylline Oracles.

rabbinic interpretations of Scripture – the Targumim, Midrash, the Talmud; one essay on the Dead Sea Scrolls[9] and one on Islamic biblical interpretation in the Koran (essentially a dry hole).[10] It considers 'Maps of the Biblical World' and 'Dictionaries and Encyclopedias' and directs substantial attention to art, music, Western literature, lexicons and to historical and literary issues in contemporary biblical interpretation, giving special treatments to the particular questions. These matters may perhaps be best addressed in a discussion of significant Old Testament and New Testament issues, of particular pieces of special interest, of confessional and hermeneutical traditions, and of questions of method.

Old Testament Issues

Essays on the historical analysis of Old Testament topics appear to be generally stronger than their New Testament counterparts. Many are largely devoted to a history of research in which the views of the contributor become evident only in the writers selected as representative, and they usually leave open-ended the current state of the art with scholars of different viewpoints duly noted.[11]

History

The most significant pieces on Israel's history[12] give major attention to source criticism within the history of research, less to the themes or to the theology of the biblical material. Although their disregard

[9] 'Dead Sea Scrolls:' I, 253–256, a good but unfortunately brief survey. There are no articles on particular DSS documents, even on those concerning biblical interpretation.

[10] 'Quranic and Islamic Interpretation of Biblical Materials:' II, 356–360. The good bibliography, along with its survey of selected literature, may be useful for Koranic scholars. Its bibliography lacks W. St. Clair-Tisdall, *The Original Sources of the Qu'rân* (London, 1905) and A. Geiger, *Judaism and Islam* (New York, 1970). But see 'Jesus, Quest of the Historical:' I, 582.

[11] Exceptions are 'Daniel, Book of,' and to some extent 'Isaiah, Book of,' where the diversities of modern historical-critical scholarship are insufficiently recognized. For a more adequate survey cf. B. S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia 1979), 316–338, 611–622.

[12] E.g. 'Deuteronomistic History,' 'Deuteronomy,' 'Genesis, Book of' (good analysis from a Jewish perspective), 'Chronicles, Books of,' 'Ezra and Nehemiah, Books of,' 'Kings,

is compensated for somewhat by a general essay on Old Testament theology,[13] they would have been strengthened by a greater consideration of the biblical writers' purpose and interpretation as viewed by the contributor and by other modern writers.

Most essays concentrate on the historical concerns of the modern period of mainstream research, i.e. that the earlier historical books (Genesis–II Kings) began as smaller written units or sources and, for most scholars, came into their present form only about the time of the Exile or later.[14] Some note criticisms of J. Wellhausen, an outstanding nineteenth-century representative of this approach, for imposing an evolutionary and, one may add, a Hegelian[15] pattern in his reconstruction.[16] Others are concerned with Scandinavian and British schools' advocacy of a long-term oral transmission and, quite different, with the claimed use of folklore.[17]

Books of,' 'Leviticus, Book of' (especially wide-ranging survey), 'Pentateuchal Criticism' (good summary of contemporary trends), 'Samuel, Books of.' A bibliographical item to be added: A. R. Millard and D. J. Wiseman (eds.), *Essays on Patriarchal Narratives* (Winona Lake, IN, 1983).

[13] 'Theology, Old Testament:' II, 562–568. From a different perspective, *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, 5 vols., ed. W. A. Van Gemeren (Grand Rapids, 1997), and *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (Grand Rapids, 1974–), are concerned with the connotation of Hebrew and Aramaic terms.

[14] Cf. II Kg 25:27. But see 'Pentateuchal Criticism:' II, 260f., for recent breaks from this tradition. Cf. also W. H. Green, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis* (Grand Rapids, 1979 [1895]); O. T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses*, 2nd edn. (Philadelphia, 1949); G. C. Aalders, *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch* (London, 1949), 157f. ('final redaction' in the time of David); U. Cassuto, *The Documentary Hypothesis and the Composition of the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem, 1961); Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel* (London, 1961); the discussion in G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids, 1979), 8–13 (date), 15–32 (theology); idem, *Genesis 1–15* (Waco, TX, 1987), xxv–xlv; idem, 'Pondering the Pentateuch: The Search for a New Paradigm,' *The Face of Old Testament Studies*, ed. D. W. Baker *et al.* (Grand Rapids, 1999), 116–144; B. K. Waltke, *Genesis* (Grand Rapids, 2001), 17–54.

[15] Cf. W. F. Albright, *History, Archeology and Christian Humanism* (London, 1965), 136–140; H. J. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, 3rd edn. (Neukirchen, 1982), 195, 258, 260–264; A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, 2nd edn. (Cardiff, 1962), 1f., although the contribution on 'J. Wellhausen:' II, 630, denies this.

[16] E.g. 'Deuteronomy:' I, 287ff.; 'Pentateuchal Criticism:' II, 259. For further criticisms cf. Aalders (note 14) 19–29; Ellis (note 1), 6.

[17] E.g. 'Genesis, Book of:' I, 440; 'Pentateuchal Criticism:' II, 259. Cf. 'Folklore in Hebrew Bible:' I, 402–406; 'Form Criticism, Hebrew Bible:' I, 411. But see J. B. Kofoed, *Text and History* (Winona Lake, IN, 2005), 69–82, 109–112.

If one grants a documentary process from the time of Moses[18] or shortly thereafter,[19] a key question still remains unresolved and here largely unaddressed: the precise nature and process of the creation and transmission of the traditions and of the Old Testament documents. Some pointers are offered, however, such as (1) R. Brinker's and E. Robertson's thesis that, from the entry into Canaan, Pentateuchal traditions were preserved and transmitted in various sanctuaries and eventually in the temple and (2) W. R. Smith's conception of inspired tradents and G. von Rad's suggestion of 'levitical preaching as the primary medium through which these ancient liturgical traditions were shaped and transmitted and eventually recast in the Josianic era …' (I, 288).[20] M. Noth's view that a nameless individual in the Exile composed a 'Deuteronomistic History' (Deuteronomy–II Kings) is less helpful for the question, although he recognizes that it was a selection, arrangement and interpretation of traditional material.[21] Similarly, the suggestions of others that schools or circles or 'the community' composed it remain undefined and vague.

The 'Deuteronomistic History' (Dt–II Kg), not to speak of the Pentateuch as such, raises a historical-literary problem by the

[18] Cf. 'Pentateuchal Criticism:' II, 258–261, for the debate and the literature. References to Moses' writing activity in the sources should be given their due weight: e.g. Exod 17:14; 24:4; 34:27; Num 33:2; Dt 31:9, 22, 24; cf. Josh 8:32. See also the important work of S. B. Chapman, *The Law and the Prophets: A Study in Old Testament Canon Formation* (Tübingen, 2000), who argues that the collection of the Pentateuch and of the Prophets developed simultaneously: '[I]t seems likely that from the very beginning there existed one scriptural corpus grouped around the age of Moses and another collection of holy writings treating the age of the prophets' (275).

[19] Cf. A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet and Israel's Psalmody* (Cardiff, 1979), 110, who regards the Song of Deborah (Judg 5:1–31) 'from beginning to end as the work of Deborah herself' (c. 1150 BC).

[20] Cf. 'Deuteronomy:' I, 287f.; 'Kings, Books of:' II, 26; 'Pentateuchal Criticism:' II, 259; R. Brinker, *The Influence of Sanctuaries in Early Israel* (Manchester, 1946), 238–263; E. Robertson, *The Pentateuchal Problem: Some New Aspects* (Manchester, 1945) = *BJRL* 29, 1945–46, 3–24. See Josephus, *Antiquities* 4, 303f.

[21] M. Noth, *The Deteronomistic History* (Sheffield, UK, 1981), 76ff. Cf. 'Deuteronomistic History:' I, 268f. If there was such an individual, he may have been only updating earlier editions of the corpus. R. F. Person, Jr., *The Deuteronomic School* (Atlanta, 2002), 31–63, 103–135, 147, places the 'School' in the exilic (c. 586–516 BC) and post-exilic period.

presence of two striking phenomena, the elements of literary and theological unity of this corpus (cf. M. Noth)[22] and the equal elements of literary and theological variety.[23] It is a 'salvation history'[24] that is complemented by the rewoven Chronicles and by the continuing history in Ezra and Nehemiah,[25] closely associated with 'Ezra, the priest, the scribe (סֹפֵר, γραμματεύς) of the law of the God of heaven,'[26] and with the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem, and by the vision prophecies of Daniel.[27]

[22] Cf. M. Noth (note 21); see 'Deuteronomistic History:' I, 268–273. For a structural analysis see also A. F. Campbell and M. A. O'Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History* (Minneapolis, 2000), 18, 23, passim. For criticisms of Noth's hypothesis cf. T. Römer (ed.), *The Future of Deuteronomistic History* (Leuven, 2000).

[23] The literary and, to some extent, the theological variations are specified in the essays on 'Pentateuchal Criticism:' II, 258–261, 'Deuteronomistic History:' I, 270ff., 'Deuteronomy:' I, 288f., 'Joshua, Book of:' I, 627f., 'Judges, Book of:' I, 640, 'Samuel, Books of:' II, 432f., and 'Kings, Books of:' II, 26f.

[24] Regrettably, the *Dictionary* has no article on Salvation History Interpretation although a good number of its advocates are given biographical essays: e.g. John Bright, Oscar Cullmann, Leonard Goppelt, J. C. K. von Hofmann, Werner Kümmel, Gerhardt von Rad, Geerhardus Vos. Further, see G. E. Ladd, *The Presence of the Future* (Grand Rapids, 1974); idem, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, 1993); H. N. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of his Theology* (Grand Rapids, 1975).

It treats the matter briefly in 'Authority of the Bible:' I, 87–91, 89. Further, on Cullmann, see W. Rordorf, 'L'histoire du le "milieu du temps" et l'eschatologie ou la dynamique du "déjà" et du "pas encore,"' *Positions lutheriennes* 48 (2000), 123–143. The 'salvation history' hermeneutic stands in contrast to a mythological approach, which generally operates within the closed world-view of the Enlightenment. Cf. 'Mythology and Biblical Studies:' II, 188–195. But see Ellis, 'The Historical Jesus and the Gospels;' 'Reading the Gospels as History' (note 2), 3–7, 242–254; idem, 'Presuppositions and Method,' *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2002), 3–10.

[25] Cf. 'Chronicles, Books of:' I, 184, sections of which are classified by von Rad as 'levitical sermons;' 'Ezra and Nehemiah, Books of:' I, 375–382: '[The final] editor [of Ezra 1–6] worked directly from the firsthand sources, which were preserved in the Temple archives' (379). Cf. H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Waco, TX, 1985), xxiv–xxxvi.

[26] Ezra 7:12. The German *Schriftgelehrter,* i.e. Scripture scholar, catches the meaning of the term better than the English word 'scribe.' To transmit the sacred traditions was no more a part of Ezra's duties than 'to teach [God's] statutes and ordinances …' (Ezra 7:10). Cf. M. H. Floyd, '"Write the Revelation:" Hab 2:2,' *Writing and Speech in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy*, ed. M. H. Floyd *et al*. (Atlanta, 2000), 103–143, for a critique of the false separation of prophet and scribe in modern biblical studies.

[27] 'Daniel, Book of:' I, 242–249, 247f., which recognizes the 'salvation history' character of the book but, in accord with a rationalist (neo-Platonic) world-view and presuppositions like Porphyry (*apud* Jerome), it regards the prophecies to be from a second-century pseudo-Daniel because the author 'shares the limitations of all human beings' and could

Transmission

For those convinced of the divine authority of Scripture[28] and of a 'salvation history' interpretation of it, as well as for those rightly committed to reading it in its completed canonical form,[29] both the origin and context of the transmission of the biblical traditions and books, and also the point at which they reach their definitive canonical form, are important questions. The Old Testament, with the possible exception of the book of Esther, was read by mainstream Judaism as a completed canonical authority in 'pre-Christian times,'[30] probably by the second century BC. A good

not know future historical events. Cf. *ODCC,* 1309f. ('Porphyry'); A. Smith, 'Porphyry,' *OCD,* 3rd edn., 1226f.; E. R. Dodds, 'Porphyry,' *OCD*, 2nd edn., 864f. But see R. K. Harrison, 'Daniel, Book of,' *ISBE*, I, 859–866, 862: extant form by c. 450 BC; J. G. Baldwin, *Daniel* (Leicester, 1978), 19–59, 46: a c. 525–475 BC date 'for the whole;' E. E. Ellis, 'The Old Testament Canon in the Early Church,' *The Old Testament in Early Christianity*, 3rd edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 3–50, 40–44; idem, *Christ* (note 2), 255–278; A. E. Steinmann, *Oracles of God* (St. Louis, MO, 1999), 44–50, 190–193. Cf. Jerome, 'Prologue,' *Commentary on Daniel*, tr. and ed. G. M. Archer (Grand Rapids, 1958), 15f.; *MPL* 25, 491 §617–618: Porphyry regarded the book as a forgery and 'anything that [the author] may have conjectured beyond [the time of Antiochus IV] was false inasmuch as he would not have foreknown the future.'

[28] Cf. 'Authority of the Bible:' I, 87–91, for a survey of different schools of thought on this issue. See also 'Galatians, Letter to the:' I, 426–429, 426; G. W. Bromiley, 'Authority' in Bromiley (note 27), I, 365–371, 365f.

[29] Cf. 'Canonical Criticism:' I, 164–167.

[30] Rightly, 'Canon of the Bible:' I, 161–164, 162, a good essay that is stronger for the Old Testament than for the New. Otherwise: 'Textual Criticism, Hebrew Bible:' II, 541–546, 544f. Cf. Ellis, 'The Canon as a Hermeneutical Process,' *Old Testament* (note 27), 36–50. For rabbinic and other Jewish witnesses cf. Steinmann (note 27), 33–85, 135–147; (H. L. Strack and) P. Billerbeck, 'Der Kanon des Alten Testaments und seine Inspiration,' *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 4 vols. (München, 1922–28), IV, 415–451. For the New Testament canon cf. E. E. Ellis, 'New Directions in the History of Early Christianity,' *Ancient History in a Modern University. FS E. A. Judge*, 2 vols., ed. T. W. Hillard *et al*. (Grand Rapids, 1998), II, 71–92, 89–92 = idem, 'Toward a History of Early Christianity,' *Christ* (note 2), 212–241, 237–241: 'In the light of this Jewish background in which only canonical Scripture could be read in synagogue, the reading of the New Testament Gospels and letters in the Christian synagogues implies that they had an inspired and normative, i.e. canonical, status for the congregations so using them' (237). Cf. Mt 24:15 = Mk 13:14; Col 4:16; I Thess 5:27; Rev 1:3. See also D. M. Smith, 'When Did the Gospels Become Scripture?' *JBL* 119 (2000), 3–20, 19.

argument can be made that it was created and that, from its earliest traditions to its completion, it was transmitted by a cadre of sacred, i.e. inspired persons. [31]

Three classes of inspired persons are mentioned repeatedly in Old Testament texts: the prophet[32] and prophetess,[33] the priest,[34] and the counselor.[35] Some individuals – Moses, Samuel, Elijah, perhaps Isaiah – performed the functions of both prophet and priest.[36] The prophet and priest are often associated, and prophets (and the king) often fulfill their role within the temple duties and worship.[37]

The sacred traditions and books of Israel witness by their received character that they, like the New Testament Gospel traditions and letters,[38] were created and transmitted by a special and accredited religious class.[39] They are not the products of jackleg preachers nor the folk traditions of an amorphous, preliterate society.[40] It is likely that the traditions and the later books were preserved by the priests

[31] I.e. those gifted to mediate a revelation of the person, the will and the purpose of God: e.g. Moses, the prophet (Exod 4:12–16; Dt 18:18); the priests (Dt 31:9–13; Mal 2:7); Ahithophel, the wise man (II Sam 16:23). Somewhat differently, 'Inspiration of the Bible:' I, 543–545, a careful if limited inductive analysis which appears to follow Karl Barth's view of Scripture as 'witness' to revelation. See also Ellis, *Christ* (note 2), 255–278. Still valuable is B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Phillipsburg, NJ, 1999 [1948]). Otherwise: J. E. Atwell, *The Sources of the Old Testament* (London, 2004).

[32] Cf. 'Prophecy and Prophets, Hebrew Bible:' II, 310–317, 316.

[33] Exod 15:20 (Miriam); Judg 5:1–31 (Deborah); II Kg 22:14 (Hulda); Neh 6:14 (Noadiah). Cf. Isa 8:3; I Cor 11:5; 14:34f.; Rev 2:20; Johnson, *Psalmody* (note 19) 31–38, 109–129.

[34] 'Within his own sphere he [the priest] was originally as much a medium of revelation as the prophet' (Johnson, *Cultic Prophet,* note 15, 8).

[35] Cf. II Sam 16:23 (Ahithophel); I Kg 3:12; Pv 1:1 (Solomon); Ezra 7:25 (Ezra); Jer 18:18. Among the Old Testament wisdom books 'Proverbs, Book of:' II, 320–323, gives attention to the theology, the concept of wisdom and the book's literary form; 'Qohelet:' II, 346–354, gives a thorough review of research but is a less persuasive (though traditional) interpretation: 'the world as a whole lacks meaning and purpose.' See C. G. Bartholomew, *Reading Ecclesiastes: Old Testament Exegesis and Hermeneutical Theory* (Rome, 1998).

[36] E.g. Exod 4:10–17; 34:5–8; I Sam 3:19f.; 7:9; 10:8; I Kg 18:36–39; cf. Isa 6:1–4.

[37] 'Myth and Ritual School:' II, 187f., offers an excellent summary of the origin, developments and influence of this approach to Old Testament studies.

[38] Cf. Ellis, 'The Making of the Gospels,' 'The Composition of the New Testament Epistles,' 'Traditions of the Johannine Mission,' *Making* (note 24), 2–27, 138f., 143–237.

[39] There were probably also traditions of false prophets, priests and wisdom teachers that were tested, sifted and rejected by the temple authorities.

[40] See the qualifications made in 'Folklore in Hebrew Bible:' I, 402–406.

in the sanctuaries[41] and later in the temple of Solomon and in the second temple.[42] Traditioned pieces and books of the writing prophets were probably also preserved and transmitted by the 'sons'[43] and 'companies'[44] of the prophets, i.e. 'charismatic'[45] prophetic groups or schools who clustered around major prophetic figures and who composed, transmitted and perhaps elaborated their teachings.[46] These gifted individuals, almost always unnamed, would have rewritten and updated the sacred documents as the parchment decayed and as the language changed.[47] For example, whether the Pentateuch came into substantially complete form by the united monarchy[48] or, as commonly thought, was assembled more slowly; whether the book of Isaiah is a 'huge mosaic' summing up the works of Isaiah's fifty-year ministry (c. 700 BC; Motyer, cf. Oswalt)[49] or, as commonly thought, is a three-stage or more composition within the Isaian school (c. 500 BC),[50] – one would still have

[41] See the *Dictionary* articles cited above, note 20; I Sam 10:25.

[42] Cf. II Kg 22:8ff.; 23:2f.; Ezra 6:15–18; Neh 8:4–9; 9:3; Josephus, *Antiquities* 3, 38; 4, 303f.; 5, 61; idem, *War* 7, 150; Steinmann (note 27), 111–113.

[43] Cf. I Kg 20:35; II Kg 5:22; 6:1; 9:1.

[44] I Sam 10:5, 10; 19:20; I Kg 18:4, 13; II Kg 2:2f.

[45] Cf. I Sam 10:1–11 for ecstatic manifestations, but 'charismatic' = 'gifted' is a broader conception. Cf. E. E. Ellis, '"Spiritual" Gifts in the Pauline Community,' *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*, 5th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 23–44; idem, 'Charism and Order in Earliest Christianity,' *Making* (note 24), 28–32; idem, 'The Spirit and the Gifts,' *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society*, 5th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2005), 26–52. See below, note 53.

[46] E.g. Samuel (I Sam 19:20), Elijah (II Kg 2:2f.), Elisha (II Kg 6:1), Jeremiah (Jer 36:4–32; cf. 'Jeremiah, Book of:' I, 564–574, 571f.). A. F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings* (Washington, DC, 1986), postulates a 'Prophetic Record' preceding the Deuteronomistic History, 'an early document, extending from I Sam 1:1 to II Kg 10:28' (1, cf. 111–123), that was organized and transmitted by 'northern prophetic circles' (1) and was later incorporated into that History. See above, notes 21ff.

[47] Such rewriting would have been especially widespread after Antiochus IV's destruction of many Scriptures in c. 169 BC. Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament* (note 27), 43f. Cf. E. Tov, 'The Copying of a Biblical Scroll,' *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran* (Tübingen, 2008), 107–127.

[48] See above, note 14.

[49] J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester, 1993), 31; cf. J. N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah*, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids, 1998), I, 23–28; II, 3–6.

[50] Reflected but not argued in 'Isaiah, Book of:' I, 549–555. But see H. G. M. Williamson, *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction* (Oxford, 1994), 6–8, 8–18, 240–244.

to reckon with an updating and some rewording by a number of tradents over a considerable period of time.

This conception of the growth of the Old Testament, briefly addressed by a number of the *Dictionary* articles, explains the continuing preservation of the documents and their use in the worship of ancient Israel and of early Judaism. It shows why the Hebrew throughout the documents is relatively uniform: It is not because the whole corpus was created in the Exilic/post-Exilic period[51] but because the prophetic consciousness of the tradents emboldened them to update and reword the texts in order to render their meaning more clearly to contemporary hearers. This prophetic consciousness continued to be manifested in the altered biblical texts of the 'midrash pesher'[52] at Qumran and of the 'peshered' citations and expositions of the prophets of messianic Judaism, i.e. of the New Testament church.[53] But for mainstream Judaism it ceased already in the intertestamental period and defined the point at which the rabbis then sought to preserve the 'archetype text.'[54] This view of the matter is supported by the first-century historian, Josephus[55]

[51] Cf. the critique of P. R. Davies (*In Search of 'Ancient Israel'* [Sheffield, 1992] and of T. L. Thompson (*Early History of the Israelite People* [Leiden, 1992]) by I. W. Provan, 'Ideologies, Literary and Critical,' *JBL* 114 (1995), 585–606, 602–605.

[52] 'Midrash:' II, 155–157, restricts itself largely to rabbinic writings but 'Inner-biblical Interpretation,' I, 538–543, gives some attention to *pesher*. Cf. also E. E. Ellis, 'Midrash Pesher,' *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 6th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003 [1957]), 139–148; idem, 'A Note on Pauline Hermeneutics,' *NTS* 2 (1955–56), 127–133; K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*, 2nd edn. (Philadelphia, 1968), 183–202; W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula, MT, 1979); Ellis, 'Midrash,' *Old Testament* (note 27), 91–101. But see M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim* (Washington, DC, 1979), 250–252.

[53] Cf. Ellis, 'The Formation of the New Testament Documents as the Enterprise of Prophets,' *Making* (note 24), 42–45; idem, 'Prophecy as Exegesis,' *Prophecy* (note 45), 145–253.

[54] Cf. I Macc 9:27; Josephus, *Against Apion* I, 38–41; 'Textual Criticism, Hebrew Bible:' II, 541–546, treats some issues posed by the Qumran and other texts, but it gives most attention to modern textual criticism, whose concerns and goals are not all that different, however, from those of the ancient rabbis and of the Christian writers (e.g. Jerome) who interacted with them.

[55] Josephus, *Against Apion* I, 41f. (Loeb): 'From Artaxerxes to our own time the complete history has been written, but has not been deemed worthy of equal credit with the earlier records, because of the failure of the exact succession of the prophets …. Although such

and by a tradition in the Tosefta and in the Babylonian Talmud.[56] If true, it also shows the fallacy of dating a book's origin from internal, literary features of the extant manuscript.

Such (later) traditions do not give assured results, but they agree with earlier evidence for the origin and transmission of biblical traditions. The tradents, from the perspective of the first century AD, may be designated, broadly speaking, prophetic teachers or teaching prophets.[57] They also engaged in commentary (midrash) on earlier received Scriptures, both in the Old Testament and in the New.[58] Such persons were also thought by some later writers to be involved in the production of the Septuagint.[59] For the Targums the rabbis apparently regulated their production and use.[60]

New Testament Issues

In German universities of the 1950s New Testament professors were classified by students as 'rabbinists'[61] or 'Hellenists'[62]

long ages have now passed, no one has ventured either to add, or to remove, or to alter one syllable [of them], … [but] to regard them as the decrees of God ….'

[56] Tosefta Sotah 13:2 (13:3); BT Sanhedrin 11a, *Baraitha* (Socino): 'Since the death of the last prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, the Holy Spirit [of prophetic inspiration] departed from Israel ….' Cf. also M Pirke Aboth 1:1. On *Baraitha* cf. M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud … and the Midrashic Literature*, 2 vols. (London, 1903), I, 189.

[57] By the first century the ancient streams of prophecy and wisdom had pretty much merged and are manifested by the priestly oriented group at Qumran, the *maskilim* ('wise teachers'), and by the messianic-Jewish New Testament's *pneumatics*. Cf. Ellis, '"Wisdom" and "Knowledge" in I Corinthians,' *Prophecy* (note 45), 45–62.

[58] See 'Inner-biblical Interpretation, Hebrew Bible' and 'Inner-biblical Interpretation, New Testament:' I, 538–543. Further, D. W. Gooding, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis* (Cambridge, 1976). This aspect is lacking in 'Prophecy and Prophets, New Testament:' II, 317–320.

[59] E.g. by Philo (*vita Mosis* II, 37–40 = II, 7) and some Christian writers, including Jerome; cf. Ellis, *Old Testament* (note 27), 30. Cf. 'Septuagint:' II, 457–462, which also discusses subsequent translations, Origen's Hexapla and the Complutensian Polyglot. For the history of the Latin Bible see 'Vulgate:' II, 617–620.

[60] So, 'Targumim:' II, 531–534, 531.

[61] E.g. Joachim Jeremias, Otto Michel, K. H. Rengstorf. Only Jeremias is given a biographical sketch: I, 576f.

[62] E.g. Rudolf Bultmann and his pupils, e.g. Günther Bornkamm, Hans Conzelmann, Ernst Fuchs, Ernst Käsemann, Philipp Vielhauer. Cf. I, 148f., 422f.; II, 14–16, 609–611; only Conzelmann is not given a biographical sketch.

depending on whether they emphasized Old Testament/Jewish or Graeco-Roman backgrounds of early Christian thought. Many contributions to the *Dictionary* reflect the dominant 'Hellenist' slant of the discipline, sometimes to the neglect of its Jewish backgrounds.[63]

Gospels

The useful essays on each of the four Gospels complement the 'history of research' core with some attention to composition,[64] source[65] and classical form criticism, themes that are elsewhere treated in discrete pieces. They also mention briefly recent sociological and/or non-historical literary approaches. The article on source criticism[66] is a thorough and, within its prescribed page limits, a comprehensive treatment. That on composition criticism[67] is a well-written survey of the origin, the precursors,[68] the flowering and an assessment of the discipline. But those on 'Q' and on form criticism are less happy treatments of the topics.

In 1801 Herbert Marsh of Cambridge postulated a source-document of facts used by all three Synoptic Gospels and a second source 'of precepts, parables and discourses' used only by Matthew and Luke in different copies.[69] Later writers identified the sources, respectively, as (proto-)Mark and Q. In recent decades a scholarly task force, whose project is traced and largely affirmed in the

[63] But see 'John, Gospel of:' I, 609–619, an article that is both wide-ranging and perceptive: '… this trend [toward a Hellenistic interpretation of John] has been dramatically reversed in the last third of [the twentieth] century' (616). See below, notes 89, 136 and 140.

[64] Esp 'Matthew, Gospel of:' II, 137f.; 'Luke, Gospel of:' II, 94. Further, Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 11ff.; 290f., 354 (Matthew); 251f., 355, 395f. (Luke).

[65] Esp 'Mark, Gospel of:' II, 129: 'Markan priority … is no longer … an assured result of Gospel criticism.' Further, Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 14–19, 354f., 391–396.

[66] 'Synoptic Problem:' II, 517–524.

[67] 'Redaction Criticism, New Testament:' II, 376–379.

[68] It mentions W. Wrede, J. Wellhausen, B. W. Bacon, E. Lohmeyer. Others include G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford, 1946), 59–139; N. B. Stonehouse, *The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ* (Philadelphia, 1944); idem, *The Witness of Luke to Christ* (Grand Rapids, 1951); A. Farrer, *A Study in Mark* (London, 1951); idem, *St. Matthew and St. Mark* (London, 1954).

[69] H. Marsh, 'The Origin and Composition of Our First Three Canonical Gospels,' an appendix to J. D. Michaelis, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 4 vols. (London, 1823 [1799–1801]), III, ii, 161–409, 368.

Dictionary essay,[70] has produced in imaginative ways the origin, scope, community and theology of the 'Q document.' It faces formidable problems,[71] however, that are unaddressed by the essay: (1) Despite 200 years of discussion it has never been established that Q was one document;[72] to infer it from the observation that 'one-third of the [Q] sayings occur in the same relative order in Matthew and Luke' (II, 343) is hardly adequate. (2) The extent of the hypothetical document Q is unknown; there were sixteen different reconstructions in the early twentieth century and there have been many more since then.[73] Neither they nor the *Dictionary* essay take sufficiently into account many passages found in all three Synoptic Gospels in which agreements (in content and in omission) of Matthew and Luke against Mark reveal that a Q episode is also being employed (assuming the independence of Matthew and Luke). These passages include not only 'sayings' and teachings but also narratives,[74] biblical commentary (midrashim),[75] miracles[76] and dialogues.[77] (3) No attention is given to the possibility or probability

[70] 'Q (The Sayings Gospel):' II, 343–346. For a critique of this approach cf. P. Jenkins, *Hidden Gospels* (Oxford, 2001), 54–81.

[71] Cf. Ellis, 'Source Criticism,' 'The Making of Gospel Narratives,' 'The Two Document Hypothesis,' *Making* (note 24), 14–19, 333–356, 391–393; idem, 'Questions about Q and Pseudo-Thomas,' *Christ* (note 2), 7–12; idem, *The Gospel of Luke*, 8th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 21–24.

[72] I.e. '[w]hether all the 'q's add up to form a composite Q …' (D. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q*, Edinburgh, 1993, 59). The most detailed attempt was probably V. Taylor, 'The Original Order of Q,' *New Testament Essays* (London, 1970), 92f., 95–118, who inferred the unity of Q from the common sequence of some Q episodes; but J. S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q* (Philadelphia, 1987), 68f., shows how many of them do not have a common sequence.

[73] The most recent are *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English with Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas*, ed. J. S. Kloppenborg *et al.* (Leuven, 2001); *The Critical Edition of Q*, ed. J. M. Robinson *et al.* (Minneapolis, 2000). Cf. J. Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd edn. (Edinburgh, 1920), 197–202.

[74] Mt 3:1–17; 17:1–13; 21:1–17 and parallels. Cf. Ellis, 'The Making of Narratives in the Synoptic Gospels,' *Making* (note 24), 333–356, 339; idem, 'The Historical Jesus and the Gospels,' *Christ* (note 2), 9; M. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q* (Harrisburg, 2002), 152–185.

[75] E.g. Mt 12:1–8; 21:33–46; 22:23–33; 22:41–46; 24:1–36 and parallels. Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament* (note 27), 98, 136n, 127n, 103n; idem, *Prophecy* (note 45), 157f., 251f.

[76] E.g. Mt 8:1–4, 8:14–17, 9:1–8, 9:18–26, 12:22–32 (healings); 8:23–27, 9:18–26, 14:13–21 (nature miracles) and parallels. Cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 338f.

[77] E.g. Mt 13:10–12; 21:23–27 (12:46–50; 22:15–22) and parallels.

that Q is to be explained as Matthew's and Luke's independent use of a number of common episodes or cycles of tradition.[78] (4) Many writings from the Q task force assume, without evidence, that the Q they reconstruct is the whole document and that, therefore, they can identify its theology and community of origin. Thus, they have created a hypothetical setting of a hypothetical community with a hypothetical theology of a hypothetical document Q. But what have such mental exercises to do with credible historical reconstruction?

To my mind the ministry of Luke in the mission of Paul provides a much more reliable scenario for the formation of the Gospels.[79] When Luke was in Caesarea during Paul's detention there (AD 58–60),[80] he collected the following materials for his own Gospel: (1) Mark or proto-Mark (pub AD 55–58), which was being used there in congregations of the Petrine mission;[81] (2) (Matthean) Jesus traditions being used in the Jerusalem-based Jacobean mission (Q);[82] (3) Jesus traditions being used in the (still Palestinian-based) Johannine mission and (4) other Jerusalem traditions (Lk 1–2; 24).[83]

The essay on form criticism[84] encompasses both Gospels and letters. For the former it offers criticisms of the classical form criticism's 'Sitz-im-Leben' and oral-transmission theories, shifts some genre categories and discusses 'Gospel' as a genre. For the letters[85] it refers

[78] So, e.g. B. Reicke, *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia, 1986), 60–65. See 'Reicke, Bo Ivar:' II, 380.

[79] Cf. Ellis, 'Luke-Acts: A Key to the History of Earliest Christianity;' 'The Place of Luke-Acts in Early Christianity,' *Making* (note 24), 251f., 400–405. See also C. S. Rodd, 'The End of the Theology of Q?' *ET* 113 (2001–2002), 5–12.

[80] Acts 21:8 ('we'); 23:23–27:1.

[81] Cf. Ellis, 'The Date and Provenance of Mark's Gospel,' *The Four Gospels 1992. FS F. Neirynck,* 3 vols., ed. F. van Segbroeck *et al.* (Leuven, 1992), II, 801–815 = *Making* (note 24), 357–376.

[82] Cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 263f., 288–293.

[83] Cf. Ellis, 'Traditions of the Johannine Mission,' *Making* (note 24), 154f., 162–164, 181ff.; idem, *Luke* (note 71), 67, 271; idem, *Making* (note 24), 251f., 400–403. See above, note 79.

[84] 'Form Criticism, New Testament:' I, 413–417.

[85] For a fuller treatment cf. Ellis, 'The Making of the New Testament Letters,' *Making* (note 24), 49–142; cf. 183–233.

to hymns, confessions and diatribe forms.[86] Overall, it seeks to refocus the discipline in a rhetorical direction relying on Graeco-Roman analogies. Unfortunately, for the origin, classification and transmission of Gospel episodes the essay does not take us much beyond the 1920s, and it displays no awareness of the four-decade critique and reformation of the classical discipline.[87] This newer form criticism argues that the pupils of Jesus, a prophetic teacher,[88] were taught by him to summarize and carefully to transmit his word and work, employing, with modifications, methods and a hermeneutic common to contemporary apocalyptic (Qumran) and rabbinic Judaism.[89] They continued to do so in the early years of the

[86] Following Bultmann (*Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynische-stoische Diatribe* (Göttingen, 1984 [1910]), it confuses Paul's midrash, e.g. Rom 9:6–29, with the Hellenistic diatribe. Cf. Ellis, 'Exegetical Patterns in 1 Corinthians and Romans,' *Prophecy* (note 45), 213–220, 218f.; R. Vincent, 'Derash homiletico en Romanos 9–11,' *Sales* 42 (1980), 751–788; V. P. Branick, 'Source and Redaction Analysis of 1 Corinthians 1–3,' *JBL* 101 (1982), 251–269; W. R. Stegner, 'Rom 9:6–29 – A Midrash,' *JSNT* 22 (1984), 37–52. The proem and *yelammedenu* midrash probably have, via the rabbis, an ultimate background in Hellenistic rhetoric, but the patterns in the New Testament are more immediately related to Jewish midrash. Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament* (note 27), 79n; idem, *Prophecy* (note 45), 155, 218f. Further, cf. D. Daube, DCW, II, 315–319, 346f.; I, 357–376 = *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 2nd edn. (Peabody, MA, 1994), 151–157, 161ff.; idem, 'Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis,' *Festschrift Hans Lewald,* edd. M. Gerwig *et al.* (Vaduz, 1978 [1953]), 27–44: '[The] whole Rabbinic system of exegesis initiated by Hillel about 30 BCE and elaborated by the following generations was essentially Hellenistic …' (44). See below, note 136.

[87] Summarized in Ellis, 'Classical Form Criticism,' *Making* (note 24), 19–27, cf. 30–39, 42f., 334f., 352ff.; idem, *History* (note 1), 12f. For an earlier critique cf. W. Manson, *Jesus the Messiah* (London, 1943). See 'Manson, William,' II, 118.

[88] Without excluding higher predicates. Cf. M. Hengel, *The Charismatic Teacher and his Followers*, 2nd edn. (Edinburgh, 1996), 63–71 = GT: 70–79.

[89] Cf., e.g. J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen, 1954); H. Riesenfeld, 'The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings' (1959), *The Gospel Tradition* (Philadelphia, 1970), 1–29; B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, 1998 [1961]); P. Sigal, *The Halakah of Jesus of Nazareth According to the Gospel of Matthew* (Lanham, MD, 1986); E. E. Ellis, 'New Directions in Form Criticism,' *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie. FS H. Conzelmann*, ed. G. Strecker (Tübingen, 1975), 299–315 = *Prophecy* (note 45), 237–253; idem, 'The Making of Narratives in the Synoptic Gospels,' *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, ed. H. Wansbrough (Sheffield, 1991), 301–324 = *Making* (note 24), 333–356; idem, 'Jesus' Method of [Biblical] Interpretation,' *Old Testament* (note 27), 130–138; R. Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer*, 3rd edn. (Tübingen, 1988); idem, 'Jesus as Preacher and Teacher,' in *Jesus*, ed. Wansbrough (note

Jerusalem church and, with some further reworking, employed the traditions variously in the four allied apostolic missions and in their respective Gospels: Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.[90]

The essay on the quest of the historical Jesus[91] contrasts Christian theists, who wrote lives of Jesus more in keeping with the picture in the Gospels and with the first-century Jewish context, with rationalists, who worked within an Enlightenment epistemology, a world-view closed to transcendence that offered a Jesus stripped of deity and of miracles, quite unlike the figure in the Gospels.[92] But it does not pursue the significance of this historical and theological chasm for the current cultural shift from Enlightenment modernism to relativist postmodernism (see below). The rationalist scholars supposed that they were reconstructing an 'objective' historical Jesus but, as Günther Bornkamm observed, their results were almost wholly subjective:

> [At the end of this research] stands the recognition of its own failure…. Why have these attempts failed? Perhaps only because it became alarmingly and terrifyingly evident how inevitably each author brought the spirit of his own age into his presentation of the figure of Jesus.[93]

89), 185–210; C. A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (Sheffield, 1994). Further, cf. M. Bockmuehl, 'Halakhah … in the Jesus Tradition,' *Early Christian Thought in Its Jewish Context*, ed. J. Barclay *et al.* (Cambridge, 1996), 264–278. Further, on Philonic Judaism cf. P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven* (Leiden, 1965); idem, *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism* (Edinburgh, 1996), and the literature cited. See below, note 136. Cf. also S. Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher* (Stockholm, 1994); idem, *Story as History – History as Story* (Tübingen, 2000), 101–107, 246–253, 281–299.

90 Cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 329f.

91 'Jesus, Quest of the Historical:' I, 578–585. There is no essay on Jesus' approach to Scripture as presented in the Gospels. Cf. Ellis, 'How Jesus Interpreted his Bible,' *History* (note 1), 121–132.

92 The essay stresses the latter, who apparently were influenced by earlier deists. Cf. 'Deism:' I, 262–264. Among theists one may add C. H. Dodd, *The Founder of Christianity* (London, 1971); A. Schlatter, *The History of the Christ*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, 1997 [1923]); H. E. W. Turner, *Jesus, Master and Lord*, 3rd edn. (London, 1957). Cf. also B. Chilton *et al.* (eds.), *Authenticating the Words and Activities of Jesus*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1999). Further, cf. Ellis, 'The Historical Jesus and the Gospels,' *Christ* (note 2), 3–19; idem, 'The Synoptic Gospels and History,' in Chilton (note 92), II, 49–57. The *Dictionary* has biographical sketches on Dodd and Schlatter.

93 G. Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York, 1960), 13. For 'the difficulties of achieving historical knowledge [generally] that does not rewrite the past in the modern historian's image' see, from a philosophical perspective, 'Hermeneutics:' I, 497–502, 500f.

What Bornkamm said of the 'liberal' Jesus applied in varying degrees to subsequent reconstructions – e.g. the apocalyptic Jesus (J. Weiss; A. Schweitzer[94]), the church-created Messiah (W. Wrede), the existentialist rabbi (R. Bultmann),[95] the political revolutionary (S. G. F. Brandon), the Cynic-like philosopher (J. D. Crossan), and the Seminar Jesus (R. W. Funk). The last, as one reviewer observed, was not really a first-century Jew at all but rather a strange combination of 'a kind of spiritual *enfant terrible* and troublemaker' who, at the same time, resembled a well-equipped politically correct American professor.[96] The diverse conclusions of the quests are inevitable since history, as written, is interpretation and the historical Jesus is, in the end, nothing more nor less than the particular historian's Jesus. For historical and theological reasons the most reliable historians are the four Evangelists and subsequent interpreters whose portraits of Jesus illumine, enhance and elaborate theirs.

Acts and Letters[97]

'Acts,'[98] although presenting a generally adequate history of research, is probably the essay most heavily determined by Christian Baur's Hegelian reconstruction of early Christian history.[99] It follows

[94] An English translation of the whole volume is now available: A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London, 2000). Cf. 'Schweitzer, Albert:' II, 449f.; 'Weiss, Johannes:' II, 628f.

[95] Cf. 'Wrede, Friedrich Georg Eduard William:' II, 659–661; 'Bultmann, Rudolf Karl:' I, 148f.

[96] O. Betz in *TLZ* 119 (1994) 990, 989, on R. W. Funk *et al.* (eds.), *The Five Gospels* (New York, 1993). Cf. 'Funk, Robert W.:' I, 423f.

[97] The distinction drawn by A. Deissmann (e.g. *Bible Studies*, Edinburgh 1903, 3–59) between 'letters' and 'epistles' was oversimplified if not mistaken. Cf. 'Deissmann, Adolf:' I, 264f. So were later attempts to identify a 'letter' genre or form: 'antiquity knows no binding rules for the composition of a letter,' P. L. Schmidt, 'Epistolographie,' *Der Kleine Pauly*, ed. K. Ziegler, 5 vols. (Stuttgart 1975), II, 324–377, 325. The New Testament letters are, generally speaking, teaching pieces clothed in a letter-form that combines personal communication with theological counsel. Cf. Ellis, 'The Literary Character of the Letters,' *Making* (note 24), 49–51; but see 'Corinthians, First Letter of:' I, 218–222, 221.

[98] 'Acts of the Apostles, Book of the:' I, 4–13.

[99] *Pace* 'Baur, Ferdinand Christian:' I, 112, the influence of Georg Hegel was already present in F. C. Baur, 'Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde …,' *TZT* 1831: IV, 61–206, 76, 136, 205f. = idem, *Ausgewählte Werke,* 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1963–75), I,

most directly Hans Conzelmann's mid-twentieth century three-step reconstruction in which an original near-term expectation of the parousia of Jesus (thesis) faced the problem of delay (antithesis) and resolved it with a theology of salvation history (synthesis).[100] Thus, Acts represents 'the church in its third generation.'[101] But does Georg Hegel's paradigm provide a reliable key? The intra-Christian apologetics and teaching in Acts, both of which the essay rightly recognizes but defines more doubtfully, can in my view best be ascribed to Paul's longtime co-worker Luke, writing in the early 60s.[102] And the correlation of Acts with Paul's epistles is best achieved not by the traditional equation, Acts 15 = Gal 2, but by the equation, Acts 11:29f.; 12:25 = Gal 2:1–10: Each presents Paul's *second* visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, initiated by a *revelation*, to help the *poor* and with *private* conversations but *no* general *assembly*.[103]

The essay on chronology[104] sketches and evaluates the history of research, focusing on the dates of the birth, ministry and crucifixion of Jesus (AD 30 or 33) and, in more detail, on the ministry of

1–46, 16, 76, 145f. Some have denied the Hegelian source of Baur's paradigm and of his resulting historical reconstruction. But see Ellis, 'Ferdinand Christian Baur and His School,' *Making* (note 24) 440–445, cf. 382–387; idem, 'Historical-Literary Criticism – After Two Hundred Years;' 'Dating the New Testament;' 'The Origin and Composition of the Pastoral Epistles,' (note 1), 7f., 18–22, 41–43, 66. The conjecture of a continuing opposition between Paul and Peter, integral to Baur's theory, apparently originated with T. D. Morgan, *The Moral Philospher* (New York, 1977 [1737]), 50–80, 362ff. See 'Galatians, Letter to the:' I, 426.

[100] H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (London, 1960), 131–136; idem, 'Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity,' *Studies in Luke-Acts. FS P. Schubert*, ed. L. E. Keck *et al.* (New York, 1966), 306f. Cf. Ellis, 'Eschatology in Luke;' 'Toward a History of Early Christianity,' *Christ* (note 2), 117f., 215f.; idem, 'Dating the New Testament,' *History* (note 1) 48.

[101] See above, note 98 (I, 11). Similar, G. Strecker, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin, 1996), 438 = ET: 417: '[Luke] attempted a synthesis between history and the eschaton ….'

[102] See the careful case made by C. J. Hemer, 'The Authorship and Sources of Acts;' 'The Date of Acts,' *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (Tübingen, 1989), 308–410. Cf. Ellis, '"The End of the Earth" (Acts 1:8),' *History* (note 1), 53–63; idem, *Making* (note 24), 389ff.

[103] Cf. Hemer (note 102), 183, 261–265; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (Dallas, 1990), lxxxii–lxxxviii; Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 255–260.

[104] 'Chronology, New Testament:' II, 193–198.

Paul.[105] For Paul it generally follows the reconstruction of John Knox,[106] who also wrote in the shadow of F. C. Baur,[107] and, virtually eliminating the book of Acts as a historical source, it presents (briefly) a Pauline chronology sought solely from Paul's letters. The problem involved in this approach is stated most incisively by W. D. Davies:[108]

> [I]t is difficult to exchange tradition with imagination (as we find it in Acts) for imagination (however reasonable) without tradition [as we find it in Dr. Knox's reconstruction].

Theories of interpolations into certain letters[109] and of combinations of earlier letters or letter fragments into the present canonical document[110] are discussed in a number of essays. But apart from Romans[111] and perhaps Ephesians,[112] where textual evidence is present for the possibility of multiple editions, they (with no manuscript support) lose all historical probability in the face of Kurt Aland's telling observation:

[105] See also Ellis, 'Fix Points for Placing the New Testament Documents;' 'The Relationship of the Four Apostolic Missions and the Dating of New Testament Writings,' *Making* (note 24), 239–307, 307–319.

[106] Esp John Knox, *Chapters in the Life of Paul* (Nashville, TN, 1950); idem, 'Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus,' *Studies in Luke-Acts. FS P. Schubert*, ed. L. E. Keck *et al.* (Nashville, 1966), 286.

[107] This is evident in J. Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (Chicago, IL, 1942), 81, 164, passim, where aspects of Baur's Hegelian reconstruction are recast in terms of Marcion vs. 'conservative reactions' (166f.). See also Knox, 'Acts,' in Keck (note 106), 286, and idem, *Chapters* (note 106), 166, where he, like Baur, dated Luke-Acts well into the second century (AD 125 or 150). Cf. 'Knox, John:' II, 34f.

[108] W. D. Davies, 'Paul the Apostle,' *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,* 2 vols., ed. L. A. Loetscher (Grand Rapids, 1955), II, 854. Further, Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 253f.

[109] Cf. 'Corinthians, First Letter to the:' I, 221: 'it is probably better … to take the letter as a unity.'

[110] 'Corinthians, Second Letter to the:' I, 224f.; 'Galatians, Letter to the:' I, 428 (O'Neill); 'Philippians, Letter to the:' II, 282; 'Thessalonians, First and Second Letters of:' II, 571; 'Pastoral Letters:' II, 245; 'Peter, First Letter of:' II, 270: two forms of the letter sent to two different audiences (C. F. D. Moule, *NTS*, 3, 1956–57, 1–11, 10f.).

[111] E.g. Rom 1:7, 15 G; 14:23 A; 15:33 *p*46. Cf. T. W. Manson, 'St. Paul's Letter to the Romans – and Others,' *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles* (Manchester, 1962), 225–241; 'Romans, Letter to the:' II, 417.

[112] Eph 1:1 *p*46 ℵ B. Cf. E. Best, 'Recipients and Title of the Letter to the Ephesians,' *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. H. Temporini *et al.* (Berlin, 1972–), 2, 25, 4 (1987), 3247–3279.

> [I]t appears to be quite impossible that an interpolator, who anywhere in the stream of tradition arbitrarily inserted three verses, could force under his spell the total textual tradition (which we today have before our eyes in a way entirely different from any generation before us) … so that not even one contrary witness remained …. [113]

That is, either the letter was composed in multiple for congregations in different cities (Galatians) or, as Aland notes, copies were made immediately for neighboring congregations. In accord with custom and necessity the author retained a copy, and in all likelihood the congregation from which he wrote would also want a copy, so that a number of textual traditions were present virtually at the outset. Except for a possibly shorter Romans there is, as far as I know, no manuscript evidence for the theories. Otherwise, the literary phenomena are better understood, I think, by an interrupted process of writing (during travel) over some weeks or months (II Corinthians)[114] or by the author's own inclusion or addition of non-authorial material as he composed the document.

All essays handle well the history of research, and Romans is particularly good. A number give attention to preformed traditions,[115] sometimes misnamed 'prePauline,'[116] and to opponents, who are given a scatter of identifications and backgrounds.[117] The

[113] K. Aland, 'Neutestamentliche Textkritik und Exegese,' *Wissenschaft und Kirche. FS E. Lohse,* ed. K. Aland (Bielefeld, 1989), 132–148, 141. His remark concerns Romans, but it applies equally to all New Testament letters. Otherwise: W. O. Walker Jr., *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters* (Sheffield, 2001), 38–90.

[114] Somewhat differently, C. K. Barrett, *Commentary on II Corinthians* (Peabody, MA, 1987 [1973]), 244: 'Paul had further news from Corinth … ; he could have decided to add [II Cor 10–13 as] a supplement …. [But] more likely … he had already sent i–ix.'

[115] 'Ephesians, Letter to the:' I, 338; 'Philippians, Letter to the:' II, 283; 'Colossians, Letter to the:' I, 209; 'Pastoral Letters:' II, 245f.; 'Peter, First Letter of:' II, 269f.; 'Peter, Second Letter of:' II, 271; 'Revelation, Book of:' II, 392f. (sources). Cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 49–142, 183–233.

[116] Paul probably was converted within six to nine months after Jesus' death and resurrection (5 April 33) and published the earliest New Testament document (Galatians, AD 49). Cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 248–251, 256–260. Therefore, while many pieces – Jesus traditions, biblical commentary (midrashim), hymns, confessions, vice and virtue lists, congregational and household regulations – were used in the congregations of his and/or other apostolic missions before they were incorporated into his letters, few apart from Jesus traditions can be identified as pre-Pauline.

[117] 'Corinthians, Second Letter to the:' I, 225f.; 'Galatians, Letter to the:' I, 428; 'Colossians, Letter to the:' I, 208f.; 'Thessalonians, First and Second Letters to the:' II, 571; 'Johannine Letters:' I, 605f.

preformed pieces are greater in number and variety than they recognize,[118] however, and the opponents are very likely one type,[119] who originated in the Judaizing segment of the ritually strict Hebraists = 'the circumcision party' (cf. Acts 6:1; 11:2f.; 15:5). In the diaspora, at least, they constituted a counter-mission that promoted a Judaizing-gnosticizing ideology in opposition to the four allied missions of James, John, Paul and Peter[120] and, as J. B. Lightfoot argued, were the forerunners of a later group opposed by Ignatius in the early second century.[121]

Preformed traditions, a number nonauthorial, make up a considerable percentage of many New Testament letters.[122] This and the input of secretaries[123] and co-senders and co-authors,[124] difficult

[118] Cf. Ellis, 'The Making of the New Testament Letters;' 'Traditions of the Johannine Mission,' *Making* (note 24), 49–142, 183–233.

[119] Rightly, W. Schmithals, *Paul and the Gnostics* (Nashville, 1972), 242–245, although his identification of them as Gnostics anticipates a later development and is anachronistic; D. Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (Philadelphia, 1986 [1964]), 174, although his characterization of them as a *Hellenistic* Jewish mission is doubtful (60, 315).

[120] Cf. Ellis, 'The Opposition Common to the Missions,' *Making* (note 24), 314–318; idem, 'Paul and his Opponents,' 'The Circumcision Party and the Early Christian Mission,' *Prophecy* (note 45), 80–115, 101–115; 116–128. See also, 'Gnostic Interpretation:' I, 451–453, and below, note 189.

[121] J. B. Lightfoot, 'The Colossian Heresy;' 'The Essenes,' *Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Peabody, MA, 1994 [2nd edn., 1879]), 73–113, 349–419; idem, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 3 vols. in 5, 2nd edn. (London, 1889), II, i, 373–388; Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 316f.

[122] As identified, e.g. in the commentaries of M. Dibelius; in E. Lohmeyer, *Kurios Jesus* (Heidelberg, 1928); J. T. Sanders, *New Testament Christological Hymns* (Cambridge, 1971); G. E. Cannon, *The Use of Traditional Materials in Colossians* (Macon, GA, 1983); E. E. Ellis, 'Traditions in 1 Corinthians,' *NTS* 32 (1986), 481–502. They appear to comprise about 54% of Ephesians and over 40% of Colossians, I Timothy, Titus; further, Romans 27%, I Corinthians 17%, II Corinthians 11%, Galatians 32%, Philippians 7%, I Thessalonians 37%, II Thessalonians 24%, II Timothy 16%, Hebrews 37%, James 12%, I Peter 39%, II Peter 33% or 55%, Jude 72%. There are also a considerable number in I John and in Revelation. Cf. Ellis, 'The Making of the New Testament Letters,' *Making* (note 24), 49–142, cf. 183–237.

[123] Cf. O. Roller, *Das Formular der Paulinischen Briefe* (Stuttgart, 1933); E. R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (Tübingen, 1991); J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter Writer* (Collegeville, MN, 1995), 6–37; Ellis, 'Twentieth Century Literary Critical Developments,' *Making* (note 24), 325–329.

[124] E.g. E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, 1981 [1947]), 9–14, 26–33, regarded Silas, rightly I think, as the co-author of I–II Thessalonians and of I Peter. Somewhat similar: L. Goppelt, *A Commentary on I Peter* (Grand Rapids, 1993), 50f.

matters to measure, place questions of authorship and dating in a new context that is not given the attention it deserves.[125] These phenomena have increasingly been identified and they undermine, if they do not eviscerate, theories that one can evaluate or even determine authorship by internal criteria of, e.g. vocabulary, style and theological expression. Scholars in the Baur tradition,[126] in particular, have used such criteria to identify as pseudepigrapha, for example, six epistles ascribed to Paul[127] and the two ascribed to Peter. Such judgments, however, to have any historical-critical basis, must take fully into account the nonauthorial influence or input into the letter. Theologically, they will also have to consider the implications of the pseudepigraphal theory for the New Testament canon since in early Christianity apostolic pseudepigrapha inevitably had the taint of forgery and, when detected, were excluded from books approved for reading in church.[128] Critical studies, both of the authorship and of the dating of New Testament letters, can no longer draw conclusions purely on literary phenomena but will now need to give more weight to the ascriptions in the letters themselves and to the early patristic testimony.

[125] A number of essays do briefly address these issues. See above, note 115.

[126] Specifically, Baur–Hilgenfeld. Hilgenfeld raised the number of 'genuine' Pauline letters from four to seven (Romans, I–II Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, I Thessalonians, Philemon), which became the standard for this tradition. Cf. 'Hilgenfeld, Adolf:' I, 503f.; Ellis, 'The Views of the Baur Tradition,' *History* (note 1), 18–22; idem, *Making* (note 24), 435–445.

[127] I.e. Ephesians, Colossians, II Thessalonians, I–II Timothy, Titus. The *Dictionary* essays generally lean against the genuineness of letters rejected by the Baur tradition; one excludes genuineness: 'Peter, Second Letter of:' II, 272. But see T. Zahn, 'Verfasser …,' 'Veranlassung …,' 'Die Echtheit … des zweiten Petrusbriefes,' *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 2 vols. in 1, 3rd edn. (Wuppertal, 1994 [1907]), II, 43–74, 90–112 = ET: 3 vols., 3rd edn. (Grand Rapids, 1987), II, 194–238, 262–293; J. A. T. Robinson, *Dating the New Testament* (London, 1976), 169–199 = GT: 149–210; Ellis, 'Traditions in I and II Peter,' *Making* (note 24), 120–133, cf. 293–303.

[128] E.g. II Peter by the Syrian church that thought it to be pseudonymous. The operative principle was stated by Serapion (†211; *apud* Eusebius, *HE* 6, 12, 3; cf. 3, 25, 4–7): 'For we, brothers, receive both Peter and the other apostles as Christ. But pseudepigrapha in their name we reject, as men of experience, knowing that we did not receive such [from the tradition].' Cf. Ellis, 'Pseudonymity and Canonicity of New Testament Documents,' *History* (note 1), 17–29; A. D. Baum, *Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum* (Tübingen, 2001), 32–148, 194ff.

The essay on New Testament theology[129] is good within its framework, but it is largely devoted to a line of research from J. P. Gabler through F. C. Baur and the 'history of religions' school[130] to R. Bultmann and his pupils. It should have given some attention to Adolf Harnack[131] and to Theodor Zahn,[132] the most brilliant stars in the many-spangled German biblical galaxy of their day, and to 'the Cambridge three,'[133] pre-eminent in British biblical interpretation for almost a century. It comments briefly, however, on Oscar Cullmann[134] and on a few recent Anglo-American writers. One might wish that more consideration could have been afforded to the theology of each of the letters,[135] and especially to the Jewish parallels and backgrounds of, for example, christology, eschatology and anthropology.[136] The essays, limited in length, may not have

[129] 'Theology, New Testament:' II, 556–562. To its full bibliography one may add Ladd (note 24); Ridderbos (note 24); Strecker (note 101).

[130] See 'Religionsgeschichtliche Schule:' II, 383–387; esp W. Bousset, *Kurios Christos* (Nashville, TN, 1970 [1913]). But see the response of J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (New York, 1921), and A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ* (London, 1926). Cf. 'Machen, John Gresham:' II, 107f.; 'Rawlinson, Alfred Edward John:' II, 369f.

[131] I.e. to his exegetical-theological pieces in *The Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1909), 133–165, *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels* (London, 1911), 37–89 and *Kleine Schriften zur Alten Kirche*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1980), I, 346–373, 830–845; II, 134–190, 265–304, 510–527. See 'Harnack, Karl Gustav Adolf von:' I, 481–483.

[132] Esp his commentaries. See 'Zahn, Theodor:' II, 666.

[133] See 'Lightfoot, Joseph Barber:' II, 76f.; 'Westcott, Brooke Foss:' II, 633; 'Hort, Fenton John Anthony:' I, 520. Further, Dodd (note 92); Turner (note 92).

[134] See also 'Cullmann, Oscar:' I, 234–236.

[135] There are some references in 'Hebrews, Letter to:' I, 489–491; 'Peter, First Letter of:' II, 268f.; 'Revelation, Book of:' II, 391f.

[136] As expounded, e.g. in Doeve, 'The Serviceableness of the Rabbinic Data for the Examination of the New Testament,' *Hermeneutics* (note 89), 35–51; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 4th edn. (Philadelphia, 1980 [1955]); Daube (note 86) = *DCW*, II (*New Testament Judaism*); R. P. Shedd, *Man in Community: A Study in St. Paul's Application of Old Testament and Early Jewish Conceptions of Human Solidarity* (London, 1958 = Grand Rapids 1964); O. Betz, *Jesus Der Messias Israels; Der Herr der Kirche: Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie*, 2 vols. (Tübingen, 1987, 1990); Ellis, *Christ* (note 2), passim; idem, 'Typological Interpretation – and Its Rivals,' *Old Testament* (note 27), 139–157, cf. 106–109; S. Aaron Son, *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology* (Rome, 2001). Otherwise: P. S. Alexander, 'Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament,' *ZNTW* 74 (1983), 237–246; but see Ellis, *Old Testament* (note 27), 96; idem, *Making* (note 24), 78n.

been able to include such matters. But a number do address issues of ancient rhetoric and the social world in which the letters were written.[137]

Of the four major apostles of Jesus Christ – James, John, Paul and Peter – from whose missions the whole New Testament originated,[138] a special essay is devoted only to Paul.[139] It offers a good history of the research viewed, however, largely within the framework of Continental writings, mainly within the dominant wing of German scholarship.[140] It does give due attention to E. P. Sanders' view of Paul and the Law.[141]

Confessional and Hermeneutical Traditions

For the patristic period the *Dictionary* has essays on allegorical and on typological-historical biblical interpretation,[142] and on the

[137] See 'Rhetorical Criticism …:' II, 396–399, 399–402; 'Sociology …:' II, 483–487, 487–492. Further, 'Psychology and Biblical Studies:' II, 337–341. On the social world Edwin Judge is the most knowledgeable; cf. E. A. Judge, *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First Century* (Peabody, MA, 2008); idem, *The First Christians in the Roman World* (Tübingen, 2008). See below, pp. 83–89.

[138] Each of which produced a Gospel. From the mission of James: Matthew, James, Jude; from that of John: John, I–III John, Revelation; from that of Paul: Luke-Acts, Romans, I–II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I–II Thessalonians, I–II Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews; from that of Peter: Mark, I–II Peter. Cf. Gal 2:9; Ellis, *Making* (note 24), 329f., passim; idem, 'Toward a History of Early Christianity,' *Christ* (note 2), 212–241.

[139] 'Paul:' II, 247–253.

[140] Further, see W. D. Davies, *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (Philadelphia, 1984); E. E. Ellis, 'Paul: History of Criticism; Pauline Thought,' *NBD*, 882–891; idem, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*, 6th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2004 [5th edn., 1979]), 17–34; Ridderbos, *Paul* (note 24); A. Schlatter, *The Theology of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids, 1998 [1923]).

[141] E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia, 1977). But see, e.g. D. A. Carson *et al.* (eds.), *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, 2 vols. (Tübingen, 2004); S. Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective* (Grand Rapids, 2002); T. R. Schreiner, *The Law and Its Fulfilment* (Grand Rapids, 1993), 93–121; M. A. Elliott, *The Survivors of Israel* (Grand Rapids, 2000), who argues, against Sanders, that Jewish intertestamental literature and later apocalyptic, with few exceptions, reflect not a national election of Israel but a 'special election' (186) of the faithful remnant.

[142] 'Alexandrian School:' I, 25f.; 'Antiochene School:' I, 38–40. Touching on these distinctives are essays devoted to individuals, e.g. 'Origen:' II, 225f. and 'Augustine of Hippo:'

Gnostic cults' use of the Bible;[143] but it does not address the diverse interpretive perspectives that arose in the Reformation, i.e. Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, Anabaptist and others. For the modern period it also lacks essays on Liberal Protestant,[144] Roman Catholic and Pentecostal views. But it does include pieces on Eastern Orthodox and Evangelical interpretation.[145] The former surveys the heritage of the church fathers and the traditionalist and the modern periods and offers a number of constructive suggestions on the need to distinguish Scripture and church. It is one of the few essays to include, rightly, the role of the Holy Spirit in the task of biblical interpretation.[146]

Evangelical Interpretation

Evangelical interpretation, reflecting my own tradition and confessional commitments, is in its modern expression a theological perspective and movement and a practical emphasis within recent Protestantism. The *Dictionary* essay offers a good discussion of selected questions. But it may be supplemented by comment on the movement's origins and present prospects. Evangelical thought has roots in the Reformation emphasis on the 'evangel' or gospel; in the Great Awakening in colonial America associated with the names of Jonathan Edwards[147] and George Whitefield;[148] in the wider Methodist movement;[149] and in the evangelical or 'low church' wing of the Church of England associated with, among others, Charles Simeon (1759–1836).[150] Its present Anglo-American form

I, 85–87, on the one hand and 'Irenaeus of Lyons:' I, 548, and 'Theodore of Mopsuestia:' II, 551f., on the other. See also 'Armenian Biblical Interpretation:' I, 57–60; 'Ethiopian Biblical Interpretation:' I, 353–356.

[143] See 'Gnostic Interpretation:' I, 451–453. See below, note 189.

[144] It was, admittedly, a more cohesive perspective early in the last century. See 'Fosdick, Harry Emerson:' I, 417, and in opposition, 'Machen, John Gresham:' II, 167f. and his *Christianity and Liberalism* (Grand Rapids, 2001 [1923]).

[145] 'Orthodox Biblical Interpretation:' II, 227–230; 'Evangelical Biblical Interpretation:' I, 357–361.

[146] Cf. also Ellis, 'The Word of God Hidden and Revealed,' *Christ* (note 2), 273–278; idem, 'Limitations [of Historical Method],' *History* (note 1), 14–16.

[147] See 'Edwards, Jonathan:' I, 317f.

[148] See A. A. Dallimore, *George Whitefield*, 2 vols., 3rd edn. (Edinburgh, 1995).

[149] See 'Wesley, John:' II, 632f.

[150] Cf. 'Evangelicalism;' 'Simeon, Charles;' 'Whitefield, George,' *ODCC*, 579f., 1502, 1737f.

arose largely from effects flowing from the separation of Intervarsity from the Student Christian Movement at the University of Cambridge (1910–11)[151] and from the divisions in American Presbyterian[152] and (Northern) Baptist[153] denominations in the early twentieth century. Its theological resources at first consisted mainly of writings from British Intervarsity,[154] from the old Princeton school,[155] from Calvin Seminary and its Dutch antecedents[156] and, for many students, from writings of C. S. Lewis.

A concentration on the infallibility of Scripture, on substitutionary atonement and on evangelism elided other theological divisions. But with growth in numbers and in diversity problems have increased.[157] They appear to concern chiefly the nature of biblical authority,[158]

[151] Cf. J. C. Pollock, *A Cambridge Movement* (London, 1953), 182: The issue 'mainly turned upon what attitude was adopted toward Holy Scripture and how it was used in Christian witness.' Further, cf. O. Barclay, *Evangelicalism in Britain 1935–1995* (Leicester, 1997); T. Dudley-Smith, *John Stott: The Making of a Leader; A Global Ministry*, 2 vols. (Leicester, 2001); T. Noble, *Tyndale House and Fellowship: The First Sixty Years* (Leicester, 2006).

[152] For a history of the conflict cf. D. B. Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary 1812–1929*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1996), II, 171–429; N. B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids, 1954); J. G. Hart, *Defending the Faith* (Baltimore, MD, 1994).

[153] Consisting of separating groups, some of whom rejected a historical-critical analysis of Scripture, and others who used such study within the presupposition of biblical infallibility or inerrancy. Cf. H. L. McBeth, *The Baptist Heritage* (Nashville, TN, 1987), 755–762.

[154] E.g. *The Tyndale Old Testament and New Testament Commentary Series* (London, 1950–); L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (Grand Rapids, 1955); *New Bible Dictionary*, ed. J. D. Douglas *et al*. (London, 1962; 3rd edn. Downers Grove, IL, 1996). See the essay on 'Bruce, Frederick Fyvie:' I, 143f.

[155] See the essays on 'Alexander, Joseph Addison:' I, 24f.; 'Green, William Henry:' I, 463f.; 'Hodge, Charles:' I, 511f.; 'Machen, John Gresham:' II, 107f.; 'Vos, Geerhardus:' II, 615f.; 'Warfield, Benjamin Breckenridge:' II, 622f.

[156] E.g. Aalders (note 14); L. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 14th edn. (Edinburgh, 1998 [1941]).

[157] Cf. M. J. Erickson, *The Evangelical Left* (Grand Rapids, 1997); I. H. Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided* (Edinburgh, 2000); Dudley-Smith (note 151), II, 275–278.

[158] J. B. Rogers and D. K. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible* (San Francisco, 1979), contra J. D. Woodbridge, *Biblical Authority: A Critique of the Rogers/McKim Proposal* (Grand Rapids, 1982) and Calhoun, *Princeton* (note 152), II, 413–417; Robert P. Martin, 'The Nature of the Bible's Inspiration,' *Accuracy of Translation: … with Special Reference to the New International Version*, 2nd edn. (Edinburgh, 1997), 13–17; Erickson, *Left* (note 157), 61–86. On so-called 'fictional midrash' (Mt 1–2) and apostolic pseudepigrapha cf. Ellis, *Old Testament* (note 27), 93–95; idem, *History* (note 1), 17–29; idem, *Making* (note 24), 320–329. See below, chapter 6, pp. 97–106.

feminism and egalitarianism generally,[159] and the sovereignty of God.[160] Whether evangelicalism will resolve the problems or move beyond them (or not) remain questions for the future.

Method

The essays discussed above, and the bibliography surveyed in them, mainly reflect a traditional historical-literary critical method in which a careful analysis and evaluation of historical data is sought in order to secure the meaning of the biblical writing and the intention of its author. For our time and place in history this method, with the right presuppositions,[161] has offered more, I believe, in explanation, clarification and heuristic probing of the biblical texts than any other.[162] Its results in the writings of, say, J. B. Lightfoot, Theodor Zahn or, with different theological presuppositions, Adolf Harnack[163] fully persuade me of that. Admittedly, it has suffered from rationalist aberrations and from pretensions to objectivity, and it has failed to fulfill its promise.[164] And it has been abandoned by

[159] E.g. W. A. Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?* (Wheaton, IL, 2006); V. S. Poythress *et al.*, *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy* (Nashville, TN, 2000); D. A. Carson, *The Inclusive Language Debate* (Grand Rapids, 1998); G. G. Hull, *Equal to Serve*, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, 1998); R. C. Kroeger and C. C. Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman. Rethinking I Timothy 2:11–15* (Grand Rapids, 1992); J. Piper *et al.*, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (Wheaton, IL, 1991); E. E. Ellis, 'Paul and the Eschatological Woman,' *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society*, 5th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2005), 53–86. See below, chapter 6, pp. 98–101.

[160] E.g. C. H. Pinnock *et al.*, *The Openness of God. A Biblical Challenge to the Traditional Understanding of God* (Downers Grove, IL, 1994). This view appears to be little different from the finite God of E. S. Brightman, *The Problem of God* (New York, 1930), 127–130. But see Erickson, 'The Doctrine of God,' *Left* (note 157), 87–107; N. L. Geisler and H. W. House, *The Battle for God* (Grand Rapids, 2001); D. Kennard, *The Classical Christian God* (Lewiston, NY, 2002), 11–41, 135–166. See chapter 1 above, pp. 13–17, on the finite God of free will theism.

[161] For me, Christian theism, a salvation-history hermeneutic, the role of the Holy Spirit and the theological genre of Scripture as divine revelation.

[162] Cf. Ellis, 'The Necessity and Contribution of Historical Criticism,' *History* (note 1), 10–12, 16. Of course, method is never master of Scripture.

[163] See the bibliographies in the *Dictionary*'s biographical sketches.

[164] After two centuries of research, there is no abiding consensus among biblical interpreters about the reconstruction of events nor about the meaning of any substantive biblical passage.

many contemporary biblical interpreters, including contributors of some essays to the *Dictionary*. But its failure is due, I think, more to mistaken assumptions about the nature of historical knowledge and about the competence of human reason than to the adequacy of the method itself.

Subjective Historical-Critical Interpretation

In the past two centuries history-writing has been viewed by many as a science that can 'objectively' recreate the past 'as it actually occurred.'[165] In fact it is quite subjective, as a number of historians observed early in the last century. The modern historian does not stick to the facts, Carl Becker wrote, 'the facts stick to him, if he has any ideas to attract them.'[166] Everyone always has presuppositions that influence one's understanding of history, as R. Bultmann[167] and from different perspectives Cornelius Van Til[168] and Bernard Lonergan[169] argued.

Postmodernism

Postmodernism,[170] a concept easier to describe than to define,[171] popularized for biblical studies this insight, i.e. that one brings

[165] 'Wie es eigentlich gewesen,' the misunderstood phrase of L. von Ranke, *Geschichte der romantischen und germantischen Volker von 1494–1514*, 3 vols., 3rd edn. (Leipzig, 1885 [1824]), I, vii. It is not in the English translation, *History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations 1494–1514* (London, 1909).

[166] C. L. Becker, 'Detachment and the Writing of History,' *The Atlantic Monthly* 106 (1910), 524–536, reprinted with other essays in 1958. Cf. also H. S. Commager, *The Nature and Study of History*, 2nd edn. (New York, 1984), 53–60; J. Kenyon, *The History Men*, 2nd edn. (London, 1993); Ellis, 'The Subjectivity of Historical Knowledge,' *History* (note 1), 4–6.

[167] R. Bultmann, 'Is Exegesis without Presuppositions Possible?' *Existence and Faith* (New York, 1960), 289–296.

[168] Van Til's insights were better than his syntax, so it is good to have a commentary on many of his writings: G. L. Bahnsen, *Van Til's Apologetic* (Phillipsburg, NJ, 1998).

[169] B. Lonergan, 'History and Historians,' *Method in Theology* (New York, 1973), 197–234.

[170] See 'Post-Modern Biblical Interpretation:' II, 305–309.

[171] Cf. A Munslow, 'Three Approaches to Historical Knowledge,' *Deconstructing History* (London, 1997), 18–35; K. J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in This Text?* (Grand Rapids, 1998); T. C. Oden, 'So What Happens after Modernity?' *The Challenge of Postmodernism*, ed. D. S. Dockery (Grand Rapids, 2000), 392–406; M. J. Erickson, *Truth or Consequences: The Promise & Perils of Postmodernism* (Downers Grove, IL, 2001).

one's own presuppositions and concepts to the texts. But its proponents then often concluded that the reader inevitably 'deconstructs,' i.e. fits the text to his presuppositions or interests with the result that it is relativized and has no certain nor objective meaning. Postmodernism's virtue is in destroying the myth of the 'wanna be objective' historian, showing that all readings of a text are influenced by one's presuppositions; its problem (or fallacy) is its assumption that all presuppositions are of equal value[172] and that no presuppositions or interpretations can accord with the intention of the author of the text.[173] It also appears to blur or to deny a distinction between an objective truth and the subjective human apprehension of that truth.

Non-Historical Literary Interpretation

The topics of many essays in the *Dictionary* follow or include a non-historical literary approach to the biblical text that arises out of or has much in common with postmodernism.[174] They often assume or promote the view that the goal of interpretation is not to discover authorial intent but to explicate the impact that the language of Scripture has on the reader or, in effect, to express, illuminate or confirm the attitude that the reader brings to the text.[175] Although at least one essay argues that some postmodern interpretation 'does

[172] Cf. Bartholomew (note 35), 173–205, 205.

[173] For Scripture, this can be challenged theologically, but it is a high spiritual hurdle. If one, in a process of oscillation, allows Scripture to change one's presuppositions to become those of the Scripture, of its ultimate Author or of its discrete authors, then one may receive the truth (including the historical truth) that is present in the text. But it is a confessional truth, not a philosophical proof. Cf. Ellis (note 2). See below, note 193.

[174] E.g. 'Cultural Studies:' I, 236–238 (in part); 'Hispanic American Biblical Interpretation:' I, 505–508; 'Ideological Criticism:' I, 534–537; 'Intertextuality:' I, 546–548; 'Literary Theory, Literary Criticism and the Bible:' II, 79–85; 'Narrative Criticism:' II, 201–204; 'Psychoanalytic Interpretation:' II, 335–337; 'Semiotics:' II, 454–456; 'Social Scientific Criticism:' II, 478–481; 'Structuralism and Deconstruction:' II, 509–514, but see A. C. Thiselton, 'Structuralism and Biblical Studies: Method or Ideology?' *ET* 89 (1977–78) 329–335. Further, cf. J. A. D. Weima, 'Literary Criticism,' *Interpreting the New Testament*, ed. D. A. Black *et al.* (Nashville, TN, 2001), 150–169.

[175] E.g. 'Feminist Interpretation: I, 388–398: 'Feminist biblical interpretation involves readings and critiques of the Bible … developed to envision and implement the goals of feminism, …' (388f.).

not really move away from the text and the author as the source of meaning,'[176] this approach appears to be quite similar to an allegorical hermeneutic found in early Judaism[177] and in the patristic[178] and medieval church. It also appears to have affinities with Gnostic interpretation and with the wordplay and the analysis of letters of the alphabet found in some rabbinic exegesis.[179] Thus it falls into the danger of treating the Bible like a computer: One draws out what one puts in.

For example, the three essays[180] on feminism are fully justified to call attention both to the misuse of the Bible to condone male (e.g. a husband's) abuse and also to overlooked contributions, to mischaracterizations and to the essential importance of women in Scripture.[181] But feminists' use of the Bible to suggest a hermaphrodite origin of humanity (I, 391)[182] or to promote modern Western egalitarianism is more questionable. The Bible is a patriarchal book composed in a succession of patriarchal cultures. Even the kingdom of God in the New Testament is depicted in terms both of equality and of rank.[183] Feminism emerged in the nineteenth century and was rooted in and achieved its popularity from the *égalité* of the French Revolution, an ideology that became a part of the psyche of many Americans.[184] But is it justifiable to impose, by special pleading and strained proof-texting, this ideology on the Bible?

[176] 'Reader Response Criticism:' II, 270–273, 272.

[177] Esp 'Philo of Alexandria:' II, 283–286, 284f.

[178] 'Alexandrian School:' I, 25f.

[179] I.e. 'Gematria,' 'Notarikon.' Cf. H. L. Strack and G. Stemberger, 'Rabbinical Hermeneutics,' *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburgh, 1991), 32f. = GT: 38f. Cf. also 'Kabbalah:' II, 1–7. See above, notes 136, 143.

[180] 'Mujerista Biblical Interpretation:' II, 169f.; 'Womanist Biblical Interpretation:' II, 655–658. See above, note 175. Cf. 'Stanton, Elizabeth Cady:' II, 503f.; 'Woman's Bible, The:' II, 658f.

[181] For ethnic questions, 'Afrocentric Biblical Interpretation:' I, 13–16, seeks and in part achieves this goal.

[182] See Ellis, 'Paul and the Eschatological Woman,' 'Hermaphroditism in Gal 3:28?' *Pauline Theology* (note 45), 53–86, 82–85. On the Graeco-Roman setting cf. W. A. Meeks, 'Image of the Androgyne,' *In Search of the Early Christians* (New Haven, CT, 2002), 3–54.

[183] E.g. Mt 5:19; 20:20–23 par; 19:28; Lk 22:28–30; cf. I Cor 9:1–3 with 12:28.

[184] Which reminds me of a girl's prayer in a student Bible study at Thomas Jefferson's University of Virginia, 'And, Lord, help us to remember that Jesus said, "All men are created equal."' Cf. C. S. Lewis, 'Equality,' *Essay Collection* (London, 2000), 666ff.; C.

Equally, liberation theology[185] is right to underscore the biblical commands of love of neighbor and of personal concern and action on behalf of the poor.[186] But is it justifiable to put the Scriptures into the service of a (failed) Marxist egalitarian theory of 'a classless society without private property' (II, 69), a view that is totally absent from the Bible?[187]

The essay on homoerotic interpretation[188] presents arguments of various writers and offers some criticisms of them. But it overlooks part of the history. Such interpretations of Scripture and consequent conduct first appeared among Paul's libertine converts, who confused Christian liberty with sexual license, among his opponents[189] and among later libertine Gnostics. Among the last, such conduct is attributed, for example, to the Barbelites:

> Since they are not satiated with their promiscuous intercourse with women, [they] are inflamed toward one another, men with men, as it is written (Rom 1:27) …. For these, who are utterly abandoned, congratulate each other as if they had achieved the choicest distinction.
>
> Those among them who are called Levites do not have intercourse with women but with each other.[190]

Hesse, *The Other Enlightenment: How French Women Became Modern* (Princeton, NJ, 2001). See below, chapter 6, pp. 98–101, 104. See above, 'The Finite God of Free Will Theism,' pp. 14f.; below, chapter 5, note 29, p. 85.

185 Cf. 'Liberation Theologies:' II, 66–74; 'Asian Biblical Interpretation:' I, 70–77 (in part). Further, D. Tombs, 'Latin American Liberation Theology …,' *Faith in the Millennium*, ed. S. E. Porter *et al.* (Sheffield, 2001), 32–58.

186 E.g. Lev 19:18; Lk 10:25–37, 27; Jas 1:9, 27; 2:1–8; 5:1–5.

187 The sharing of goods in Acts (4:32–5:11; 6:1) was voluntary, partial and ecclesial. Cf. Ellis, 'Ministry for the Coming Age;' 'Pauline Christianity and the World Order,' *Pauline Theology* (note 45), 18–23, 151–159.

188 'Gay/Lesbian Interpretation:' I, 432–434.

189 Ellis, 'Paul and his Opponents,' *Prophecy* (note 45) 89–101, 108f., 113–115; cf. 231f.; idem, *Making* (note 24), 314–318.

190 Epiphanius, *Panarion* 26, 11, 8; 26, 13, 1. Cf. W. Foerster, 'Libertine Gnostics,' *Gnosis,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 1974), I, 323f.; F. Williams, ed. and tr., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, 3 vols. in 2 (Leiden, 1994).

But in Scripture – from Genesis to Revelation[191] – the copulation of male with male (ἀρσενοκοίτης) is regarded not as a sexual fulfillment but as an aberration or bondage, indeed a sexual exploitation of another. One should have compassion for those caught in this addiction,[192] but to turn the Bible's no into a yes is quite a different matter.

The non-historical literary interpretations in the *Dictionary* appear to give absolute priority to their ideological presuppositions, i.e. egalitarianism and homosexualism, and to use the Bible as a foil to promote the ideology. Consequently, there is little likelihood that their biblical interpretations have any reality beyond the mind and the imagination of the particular writer. A historical approach to the biblical text also does not escape the presuppositions of the interpreter. But if it deliberately gives priority to the text and to the historical-literary context, it is better able, I think, to subordinate and to sublimate presuppositions to the Scripture.[193]

Conclusion

The *Dictionary* properly allows the contributors to express their own views about the particular topic,[194] and it thus often offers differing views where topics overlap. But in three respects it apparently imposes an unfortunate uniformity. It regularly (with a few exceptions) uses secularist (BCE/CE) rather than Christian (BC/AD) dating symbols and the Jewish designation, Hebrew Bible, rather than the Christian designation, Old Testament. Also, presumably in deference to feminist readers, it appears to exclude the traditional

[191] Gen 9:21–27; 19:5–8; Lev 18:22f.; 20:13; Dt 23:17f.; Judg 19:16–26; I Kg 14:24; Rom 1:26f.; I Cor 6:9f.; I Tim 1:9f.; Jude 7f.; Rev 22:15; perhaps, II Pet 2:6–8, 13f. In the New Testament the practice is virtually always in vice lists.

[192] Cf. E. E. Ellis, 'Homosexuality and the Church,' *The Church Herald* 32 (27 June 1975), 6f.; J. Nicolosi, *Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality* (Northvale, NJ, 1997); R. A. J. Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice* (Nashville, TN, 2001).

[193] As, in prayer, 'the sublimation of petition in "Thy will be done"' (W. R. Inge). See above, note 173.

[194] In a few instances it appears that the editor has supplemented (and co-signed) the essay.

English generic use of the term 'man'[195] and of masculine pronouns. Each of these usages rests on or reflects theological views or presuppositions. Academic freedom would be better served, I think, if each contributor were given stylistic liberty in these matters.

In sum, this *Dictionary* is a very important resource for pastors and rabbis, faculty and students, a resource that will put at their finger-tips an immense – yes, that is the word – amount of information on the Bible and on its interpreters, ancient and modern. As always, it should be supplemented by other similar works that can complement or contrast the interpretations detailed here. But I suspect that for most essays it will find few equals in the extremely well-informed histories of interpretation, the foundation on which any good contemporary expositions of Scripture must build.

[195] The term 'man,' used in a generic sense of *homo sapiens*, includes the individual and the corporate, male and female, black and white, young and old. There is no other English word fully equivalent to it.

5

Paul and Graeco-Roman Rhetoric

According to the Scriptures God predetermined in his sovereign will to reveal his person and his purpose for fallen mankind orally and visually to prophets,[1] wise men[2] and priests[3] and through them in written form to his people.[4] He disclosed this written Word in various literary forms common to their culture and history – e.g. narrative,[5] poetry,[6] commentary on earlier written revelation

[1] E.g. Exod 4:11–16; Dt 18:18–22. Cf. E. E. Ellis, 'The Role of the Prophet in the Quest for Truth,' *Christ and the Future in New Testament History*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2001), 255–278; K. T. Aitken, 'שׁמע,' *NIDOTTE* 4 (1997), 176; C. Brown, 'Prophet,' 'Revelation,' *NIDNTT* 3, 2nd edn. (1986), 74–92, 309–340; E. E. Ellis, 'The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts,' *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*, 5th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 129–144.

[2] II Sam 14:17, 20; 16:23; I Kg 3:11f.; Dan 2:21, 48; 4:18; cf. Jer 18:18; 1QH 20:11ff. = 12:11f. Cf. E. E. Ellis, '"Wisdom" and "Knowledge" in I Corinthians,' *Prophecy* (note 1), 52–59: In Old Testament apocalyptic, e.g. Daniel, and in early Judaism the gifts of prophecy and wisdom tended to commingle (57ff.).

[3] Lev 10:11; Dt 33:8ff.; Jdg 18:3–6; Neh 8:7ff.; Jer 18:18; Hos 4:6; Mal 2:7. Cf. C. J. H. Wright, 'Ethics;' E. Carpenter, 'Exodus,' *NIDOTTE* 4 (1997), 591, 611; W. Dommershausen, 'כהן,' *TDOT* 7 (1995), 67, 72f. See above, chapter 4, note 34, p. 54.

[4] Cf. B. B. Warfield, 'The Biblical Idea of Revelation,' 'The Biblical Idea of Inspiration,' *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, 7th edn. (Phillipsburg, NJ, 1999 [1948]), 71–166.

[5] Cf. R. Parry, 'Narrative Criticism;' J. B. Green, 'Narrative Theology,' *DTIB,* 528–553; S. Byrskog, *Story as History – History as Story* (Tübingen, 2000).

[6] Cf. M. E. Travers, 'Poetry,' *DTIB*, 594–597; T. Longman and E. M. Blaiklock, 'Poetry,' *NBD*, 938ff.

(midrash).[7] Among these literary patterns is rhetoric, the topic of the present chapter.

Introduction

Scholars generally accept the influence of Greek rhetoric on post-apostolic Christian writers, probably beginning with Origen.[8] Some from the early centuries to the present have occasionally applied this influence to Paul.[9] In modern times this application represents a part of a larger division among New Testament specialists as to whether the Apostle is to be understood primarily from Hellenistic ('history of religions') or from Jewish and Old Testament ('salvation history') backgrounds.[10] Some have attributed a Greek philosophical

[7] Cf. J. Neusner, *Encyclopaedia of Midrash: Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism* (Leiden, 2005); C. A. Evans, 'Jewish Exegesis,' *DTIB*, 381ff.; Ellis, 'Midrash Pesher in Pauline Hermeneutics,' 'Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations,' 'Midrashic Features in the Speeches of Acts,' 'Exegetical Patterns in I Corinthians and Romans,' 'Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Jude,' *Prophecy* (note 1), 173–181, 188–208, 213–236; idem, *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2002), 31f., 60f., 78–81, 95f., 99–103, 105f., 114f., 117–138, 156f., 161, 166ff., 173–179, 345–348, 350f., 407n, 417. See below, Levison (note 64).

[8] So, E. Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church* (London, 1907 [1890]), 180: 'It is probable that Origen is not only the earliest example [of Christians trained in rhetorical methods] … but also one of the earliest who took into the Christian communities these methods of the [rhetorical] schools.' Cf. F. Young, 'The Rhetorical Schools and Their Influence on Patristic Exegesis,' *The Making of Orthodoxy. FS H. Chadwick*, ed. R. Williams (Cambridge, 1989), 182–199, 196.

[9] For a brief history of the research cf. R. D. Anderson Jr., *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (Leuven, 1999), 17–21; H. D. Betz, 'The Problem of Rhetoric and Theology According to the Apostle Paul,' *L'Apôtre Paul*, ed. A. Vanhoye (Leuven, 1986), 16–21; E. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1983 [1909]), II, 501–512.

[10] Cf. R. W. Yarbrough, *The Salvation Historical Fallacy? Reassessing the History of New Testament Theology* (Leiden, 2004); E. E. Ellis, 'Pauline Thought,' *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*, 6th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2004 [1961]), 24–34; W. A. Meeks, 'Judaism, Hellenism, and the Birth of Christianity' and D. B. Martin, 'Paul and the Judaism/Hellenism Dichotomy,' *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. T. Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville, KY, 2001), 17–27, 29–61. See above, chapter 4, notes 24, 61, p. 52, p. 57; chapter 1, note 61, p. 11.

background to Paul's style and terminology.[11] A good number of writers today think that I Corinthians, for example, reflects the direct influence of Greek rhetoric both in the letter's 'rhetorical' terminology and also in its composition,[12] and almost all of them attribute it to Paul.[13]

Others have subjected this (popularly Anglo-American) approach to interpreting Paul's letters to acute critique.[14] The present chapter adds to that critique in some respects, especially as to whether Paul's background is compatible with a productive knowledge, inclination and direct use of the techniques of Graeco-Roman rhetoric. In other respects it qualifies elements of that critique, *exempli gratia*, as to whether Paul's letter-form poses any inhibition to the use of Graeco-Roman rhetoric.

[11] E.g. E. L. Hicks, 'St. Paul and Hellenism, *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, 5 vols., ed. S. R. Driver *et al.* (Oxford, 1885–1903), IV (1896), 1–14, 85; R. M. Grant, 'Hellenistic Elements in 1 Corinthians,' *Early Christian Origins. FS H. R. Willoughby*, ed. A. Wikgren (Chicago, 1961), 60–66; idem, 'The Wisdom of the Corinthians,' *The Joy of Study. FS F. C. Grant*, ed. S. E. Johnson (New York, 1951), 51–55. Further, cf. L. Alexander, 'IPSE DIXIT: Citation of Authority in Paul and in the Jewish and Hellenistic Schools,' in Engberg-Pedersen (note 10), 103–127, 116–127.

[12] E.g. A. Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof* (Stockholm, 1998); idem, 'Special Topics in 1 Corinthians 8–10,' *The Rhetorical Interpretation of Scripture*, ed. S. E. Porter *et al.* (Sheffield, 1999), 272–301; B. L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis, MN, 1990), 56–59 [1 Cor. 15:1–58]; M. M. Mitchell, 'Pauline Accomodation and "Condescension" (συνκατάβασις): 1 Cor. 9:19–23 and the History of Influence,' in Engberg-Pedersen (note 10), 197–214, 205, 213f.; idem, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation* (Tübingen, 1991); J. Patrick, 'Insights from Cicero on Paul's Reasoning in 1 Corinthans 12–14,' *TB* 55 (2004), 43–64; S. E. Porter *et al.* (eds.), *Rhetoric and the New Testament. FS W. Wuellner* (Sheffield, 1993), 211–230 (J. Smit), 231–249 (D. F. Watson); W. Wuellner, 'Paul as Pastor: The Function of Rhetorical Questions in First Corinthians,' in Vanhoye (note 9), 49–77. For further bibliography cf. D. F. Watson, 'Rhetorical Criticism, New Testament,' *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, 2 vols., ed. J. H. Hayes (Nashville, TN, 1999), II, 399–402.

[13] And not to the influence of the Apostle's secretary on terminology and composition.

[14] Cf. e.g. J. D. H. Amador, *Academic Constraints in Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament* (Sheffield, 1999); Anderson (note 9); M. A. Bullmore, *St. Paul's Theology of Rhetorical Style. An Examination of 1 Corinthians 2. 1–5 in Light of First Century Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Culture* (Bethesda, MD, 1995); L. Hartman, 'Some Remarks on 1 Cor. 2:1–5,' *SEÅ* 39 (1974), 109–120; P. H. Kern, *Rhetoric and Galatians* (Cambridge, 1998); D. Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation. 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric* (Cambridge, 1994); J. T. Reed, 'Using Ancient Rhetorical Categories to Interpret Paul's Letters,' *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, ed. S. E. Porter *et al.* (Sheffield, 1993), 292–324.

To justify the present remarks requires an examination of at least five issues: (1) Paul's background; (2) the distinction between Paul's terminology that has a usage in common with rhetorical terms and his use of terminology within a technical rhetorical connotation; (3) the distinction between rhetoric in speech and in letters; (4) the distinction between prophetic speech and rhetoric; (5) Paul's own assertions regarding his rhetorical skills.

Paul's Background

Paul identifies himself as a member of the tribe of Benjamin.[15] As narrated by his longtime co-worker Luke, he was born a citizen of Rome and was also a citizen of his birth city, Tarsus, in the Imperial province of Cilicia.[16] Traditionally, it has been argued that he also received a Greek education in Tarsus[17] before coming to Jerusalem to study under Gamaliel I. But the research of W. C. van Unnik[18]

[15] Rom 11:1; Phil 3:5; cf. Acts 13:21; Rev 7:8; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (London, 1969), 277f. = GT: 148.

[16] Acts 9:11; 16:37f.; 21:39; 22:3, 26–29; 23:27. On the authorship of Luke-Acts cf. E. E. Ellis, *Making* (note 7), 377ff., 397–405; idem, *The Gospel of Luke*, 8th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003 [2nd edn., 1974]), 37–54; the discussion of J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke,* 2 vols. (Garden City, NY, 1985), I, 35–53.

[17] So, e.g. T. R. Glover, *Paul of Tarsus* (Peabody, MA, 2002 [1925]), 5–23; R. J. Knowling, 'The Acts of the Apostles,' *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, 5 vols., ed. W. R. Nicoll (Grand Rapids, MI, 1974 [1897–1910]), II (1901), 457: 'Probably Paul went to Jerusalem, not later than thirteen, possibly at eleven, for his training as a teacher of the law;' W. M. Ramsay, *The Cities of St. Paul* (Grand Rapids, 1979 [1907]), 8f., 31–43, 87f., 235. But see W. D. Davies, 'Paul: From the Jewish Point of View,' *Cambridge History of Judaism*, 3 vols., ed. W. D. Davies *et al.* (Cambridge, 1999), III, 687.

[18] W. C. van Unnik, *Tarsus or Jerusalem. The City of Paul's Youth* (London, 1962) = DT: Amsterdam 1952 = idem, *Sparsa Collecta*, 3 vols. (Leiden, 1983), I, 259–320 + 'Once Again: Tarsus or Jerusalem' (1954), 321–327, followed by, e.g. C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles,* 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1998), II, 1034ff.; E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford, 1971), 624f. = GT: 553f. Further, C. Burchard, *Der dreizehnte Zeuge* (Göttingen, 1970), 31–36. Cf. also the classicist E. Norden, 'Die Briefe des Paulus' (note 9), II, 492–510 (Nachträge, 3f.): Against the method of interpreting Paul through (hellenistic) rhetoricians and philosophers, 'I must raise a strong protest' (493). 'To the vain arguments belong also the persistent appeal to Tarsus …. For centuries "Tarsus" has been the slogan which again and again has been thrown into the scales…. Against this, however, is … Acts 22:3 …' (495). Further, the highly informed and detailed discussion of M. Hengel, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London, 1991), 18–39. Otherwise and unconvincing: N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1965), 83ff.

has shown that Acts 22:3, the only text that gives concrete information on Paul's youth, must be read as follows:

> I am a Judean man
> born (γεγεννημένος) in Tarsus of Cilicia
> but brought up (ἀνατεθραμμένος) in this city [Jerusalem],
> educated (πεπαιδευμένος) at the feet of Gamaliel
> according to the strictness (ἀκρίβειαν) of the ancestral law,[19]
> being a zealot for God as you all are this day.

The triad – born, brought up, educated – represents a biographical summary, i.e. a fixed literary unit, common to the Graeco-Roman world,[20] with ἀνατεθραμμένος referring to the nurture of earliest childhood in the parental home and πεπαιδευμένος referring to subsequent education, often under a tutor. The terms are so used by Luke elsewhere,[21] and they show that, in the view of the Apostle's frequent co-worker and biographer, Paul came to Jerusalem in his infancy or shortly thereafter.[22]

The Pauline letters agree with the more specific statements in Acts. The Apostle was from a pharisaic family strictly observant of the ritual Law. In this context he was nurtured from birth. He describes himself as 'circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew [born] from Hebrews ('Εβραῖος ἐξ 'Εβραίων), as to the Law a Pharisee,[23] as to zeal perse-

[19] I.e. 'as a Pharisee' (H. Alford, *The Greek New Testament*, 4 vols. in 5, 5th edn. [London, 1861–63], II, 245). Cf. Phil 3:5; Acts 26:5; Josephus, *War*, II, 162 (ἀκριβείας); (H. L. Strack and) P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 4 vols. in 5 (München, 1922–28), II, 765.

[20] For examples cf. van Unnik, *Sparsa* (note 18), I, 272–296 (= 1962: 17–45), 306–318. E.g. Isocrates, περὶ τοῦ ζευγοῦς ii (28); Philo, *in Flaccum,* 158; idem, *Leg. ad Gaium*, 115; idem, *de Leg. Alleg.* I, 99: Our parents 'gave us birth, nurtured us, educated us …;' Eusebius, *HE* 9, 10, 1: '… in birth and upbringing and education….'

[21] Acts 7:20ff.

[22] Cf. also Acts 26:4 (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς). On Luke as the author see above, note 16.

[23] It is precisely their adherence to ritual Law that distinguishes the Pharisees in their encounters (Mt 9:11 parr; 12:9–14 parr; 23:23 Q; Lk 7:36–39; 11:37f.; 14:1–6; 15:2; Jn 9:16) and biblical debates with Jesus in the Gospels. Cf. Mt 12:1–8 parr; 15:1–9 par. The same is true of the Christian Pharisees at Acts 15:5. Cf. also Josephus, *Vita*, 191: The Pharisees are unrivaled experts 'concerning the ancestral rules' (τὰ πάτρια νόμινα), i.e. the Halakoth.

cuting the church, as to righteousness in the Law blameless.'[24] With reference to his opponents he writes, 'Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they descendents of Abraham? So am I.'[25] Paul speaks here of his ancestry and of his (previously) strict adherence to a pharisaic lifestyle. The term 'Hebrew,'[26] unlike the term 'Hebraic,'[27] refers here not primarily to language but rather to Paul's pedigree and to his perfect observance of the ritual Law.[28]

Such a background places Paul in the higher social strata of Jewish society[29] and in a religious category of strict ritual observance that would be exceedingly difficult to follow in the Graeco-Roman diaspora where virtually every human contact would be unclean.

[24] Phil 3:5f. The six clauses – circumcised, Israelite not proselyte, of the faithful tribe of Benjamin, from a strictly observant 'Hebrew' family, a Pharisee, an ardent religious advocate and a blameless achiever of the ritual Law – represent 'an ascending scale' of social heritage and religious accomplishment. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, 6th edn. (London, 1913), 146.

[25] II Cor 11:22.

[26] Cf. E. E. Ellis, 'The Circumcision Party and the Early Christian Mission,' *Prophecy* (note 1), 116–128, 118–123; idem, *Making* (note 7), 314–318; idem, *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*, 2nd edn. (Atlanta, 2006), 93f. Cf. O. Cullmann, 'The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity,' *JBL* 74 (1955), 213–226, 220f. = *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (New York, 1957), 18–32, 26: 'The Greek word [at Acts 6:1] from which "Hellenist" is derived (ἑλληνίζειν) does not mean "to speak Greek" but "to live according to the Greek manner."' 'Whatever one says, it [also] cannot be proved that "Hebrews" [at Acts 6:1] refers to the language spoken by the people designated by this word.' Cf. also H. J. Cadbury, 'The Hellenists,' *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 5 vols., ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake (London, 1920–33), V (1933), 62ff.

[27] Ἑβραῖς, Ἑβραϊστί. Cf. Jn 5:2; 19:13, 17, 20; Acts 21:40; 22:2; 26:14; Rev 9:11; 16:16.

[28] So also at Acts 6:1. Otherwise: M. Hengel, *The 'Hellenization' of Judea in the First Century After Christ* (London, 1989), 7, who thinks (with many) that Acts 6:1 contrasts Greek-speakers with Aramaic-speakers. While this view may be valid in other situations, it does not fit these contexts. Phil 3:5 concerns pedigree, and Acts 6:1 concerns food. Neither text pertains to language issues. See above, note 26.

[29] This is evident also in Acts from his membership or activities in a Sanhedrin or sub-Sanhedrin council (Acts 7:59; 9:1f.; 26:10) and from his Roman and Tarsian citizenship (Acts 16:37f.; 21:39; 22:25–29; 23:27). Cf. E. J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul* (Tübingen, 1985), 229; Burchard (note 18), 37ff. Paul's work as a 'tent maker' has no bearing on this. The Jewish father was obligated to have his son learn a trade (BT Kiddushin 29a, *Baraitha*), and rabbis in particular were often bivocational. Cf. Billerbeck (note 19), III, 745ff; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 3 vols. in 4, 2nd edn. (Edinburgh, 1973–87), 328f. See below, note 30.

Certainly, any education in a Gentile context under Gentile tutors would seem to be excluded. Instruction in the Greek language would be available in Jerusalem even for observant Jews,[30] but education in pagan Greek literature would be very unlikely.[31]

Many indicators in Paul's writings also point to a Palestinian background.[32] And his very few references to pagan Greek literature

[30] Although no certainty is possible, several factors suggest that Aramaic was probably Paul's mother tongue: his ritually strict family background in Palestine and his early rabbinic education, which would have been in Hebrew or Aramaic (see below); the witness of Acts (26:14; cf. 21:40; 22:2) that the risen Jesus addressed Paul in the Hebrew language. So, E. Renan, *The Apostles* (New York, 1866), 163 = FT: 166.

[31] Josephus, *Ant*. 20, 263ff. Among the Hasmoneans (c. 100 BC) 'there was an old man who had some knowledge in Grecian wisdom.' But 'it was proclaimed on the occasion "cursed be the man who teaches his son Grecian wisdom"' (BT Baba Kamma 82b–83a = BT Menahoth 64b, *Baraithas*). Further cf. M Sotah 9:14; T Abodah Zarah 1:20; BT Gittin 58a; BT Sotah 49b: 'There were a thousand pupils in my father's [Gamaliel II, c. AD 90] house: five hundred studied Torah and five hundred studied Grecian wisdom,' i.e. Jewish-Grecian (Palestinian and Alexandrian) literature; they studied not pagan literature but 'obviously in the Jewish-Grecian, i.e. the Alexandrian wisdom' (Norden [note 2], II, 476n; cf. 496). Cf. P. S. Alexander, 'Hellenism and Hellenization as Problematic Historiographical Categories,' in T. Engberg-Pedersen (note 10), 63–80, 76–79: 'the Rabbis were not in any meaningful sense Hellenized' (78). On the influence of (and resistance to) Hellenism in the earlier intertestamental period cf. M. Hengel, 'The Interpenetration of Judaism and Hellenism in the Pre-Maccabean Period,' in Davies (note 17), II (1989), 167–228, 212–228; idem, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 2 vols. (London, 1974), I, 58–83, 83–106, 105: One must recognize 'the possibility that even in Jewish Palestine individual groups grew up bilingual.' 'Knowledge of Greek was the expression of higher social standing, better education and stronger contacts with the world outside ….' Cf. M. Hengel, 'Greek Education and Literature in Jewish Palestine' (note 28), 19–29; idem (note 18), 38: 'Paul seems to have gone to a good Greek elementary school, which was a *Jewish* school – because the literature from Homer to Euripides used in regular [Greek] teaching was quite alien to him. The literature that he knew … is that of the Septuagint and related religious writings;' J. A. Fitzmyer, 'The Languages of Palestine in the First Century AD,' *The Semitic Background of the New Testament; A Wandering Aramean*, 2 vols. in 1, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, 1997), 29–56, 32–38, and the literature cited; P. W. van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs* (Kampen, 1991); E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 6th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003 [1957]), 11–20, 38–84, 85–113, 135–147, 83: 'The influence of Jewish literary methods particularly and of scriptural interpretation to a lesser degree is frequently apparent;' idem, *Interpreters* (note 10), 29–34; idem, *Prophecy* (note 1), 125f; idem, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity*, 3rd edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 77–121.

[32] E.g. Paul's bilingualism, evidenced in his occasional use of the Hebrew Old Testament (I Cor 3:19; II Cor 8:15; II Tim 2:19) and perhaps of Aramaic Targums (I Cor 2:9; 15:54; Eph 4:8), in his affinities with Qumran exegetical practices and concepts and with

show no knowledge of it beyond a few schoolboy proverbs that would be profitable or appealing to a Jewish adolescent.[33]

As for Paul's letters, the classicist Eduard Norden, who was among modern scholars probably the most erudite philologist in ancient Greek, found the Apostle difficult to understand on two grounds: 'First, his manner of arguing is strange and, second, his style also, viewed as a whole, is unhellenic.'[34] My work on Paul's hermeneutic, in particular his quotation and interpretation of the Old Testament[35] and his use of preformed midrashim and of exegetical methods and midrashic techniques in the production of his epistles,[36] has convinced me of the Jewish character of his composition. Of course, the background of the secretary employed[37]

rabbinic midrash, and his apocalyptic perspectives. Cf. van Unnik, *Sparsa* (note 18), I, 201f.; Ellis, *Paul's Use* (note 31), 12, 15f., 38–84; idem, *Old Testament* (note 31), 79–103; idem, *Making* (note 7), 69–115 (some preformed traditions reflecting a Semitic background); J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul and Qumran* (London, 1968).

[33] I.e. 'Bad associates corrupt good habits' (I Cor 15:33; Menander, *Thais*); 'Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons' (Tit 1:12; Epimenides, *de oraculis* / περὶ χρησμῶν). Cf. 'For we also are His offspring' (Acts 17:28; Aratus, *Phaenomena* 5). All texts are cited in E. Nestle – B. & K. Aland, *Greek–English New Testament*, 27th edn. (Stuttgart, 2001), 375, 468, 557, 775.

[34] Norden (note 9), II, 499, where he also cites F. Nork, *Rabbinische Quellen und Parallelen zu neutestamentlichen Schriftstellern* (Leipzig, 1839), np: '… Paul's description and speech in general have the most striking similarity with the [Jewish] midrashim….' Cf. Renan (note 30), 163f. = FT: 166ff: '[T]he incorrect non-Hellenistic style of the Epistles of St. Paul was that of the Hellenistic Jews, a Greek replete with Hebraisms and Syriacisms, scarcely intelligible to a lettered man of that period, ….' 'His manner of reasoning was very curious. He certainly knew nothing of peripatetic [Aristotelian] logic….; but on the contrary, his dialectics greatly resembled those of the Talmud.'

[35] Ellis, *Paul's Use* (note 31), passim.

[36] Cf. Ellis, 'Exegetical Patterns in I Corinthians and Romans,' *Prophecy* (note 1), 213–220; idem, 'Literary Genre,' 'Midrashim,' *Making* (note 7), 5f. 49ff. 60f. 78–81, 94–103, 105ff., 114f., 407n, 417; idem, *Old Testament* (note 31), 79–101; idem, *Prophecy* (note 1), 147–197. See also P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven*, Leiden 1965, 47ff.

[37] E.g. Tertius (Rom 16:22); probably Silas (I Thess 1:1; II Thess 1:1). Cf. E. G. Selwyn, 'Silvanus,' *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (Grand Rapids, 1981 [2nd edn., 1947]), 9–17; Ellis, *Making* (note 7), 39, 58, 305n, 326f. and the literature cited; J. Murphy O'Connor, *Paul the Letter Writer* (Collegeville, MN, 1995), 8–24; E. R. Richards, *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul* (Tübingen, 1991); idem, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing* (Downers Grove, IL, 2004); O. Roller, *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe* (Stuttgart, 1933), 18–23, passim.

and of a (participating) co-sender and the preformed pieces composed by others[38] may have accentuated or diminished the Semitic or Hellenic affinities of the style and syntax in particular letters or passages.

Paul trained under the great pharisaic rabbi, Gamaliel I, and even as a Christian he apparently still considered himself to be subject to Jewish ecclesiastical jurisdiction and to be a Pharisee in certain respects.[39] With these convictions and from this perspective he had been a zealous persecutor of those who followed Jesus of Nazareth.[40]

Upon his conversion in c. AD 33,[41] Paul spent some fourteen years,[42] in the Graeco-Roman diaspora, a period of his life that is largely unknown to us. He was three years in and around Damascus (AD 33–36), nine years in and around Tarsus (AD 36–45) and about a year in Antioch, Syria (AD 45–46).[43] This was his first experience of Graeco-Roman culture outside the sphere of Palestinian Judaism[44] which, of course, had itself been under Hellenistic influence for over three centuries.[45]

[38] E.g. I Cor 2:6–16; II Cor 6:14–7:1; Phil 2:6–11; E. E. Ellis, 'Traditions in I Corinthians,' *NTS* 32 (1986), 481–502; cf. idem, *Making* (note 7), 39–42, 69–117 (passim), 327ff.; idem, *Prophecy* (note 1), 25f.; idem, *History* (note 26), 138–141; Fitzmyer, *Aramean* (note 31), 118; idem, 'The Aramaic Background of Philippians 2:6–11,' *CBQ* 50 (1988), 470–483.

[39] I Cor 9:20; II Cor 11:24; Acts 18:18; 21:23–26; 23:6; 26:5f.; cf. 5:34f.; 15:5.

[40] I Cor 15:9; Gal 1:13, 23; Phil 3:6; I Tim 1:13; Acts 7:58; 8:1ff.; 9:1–6, 13f., 21; 22:4–8, 19f.; 26:9ff.

[41] Gal 1:15f.; Acts 9:3–18; 22:6–16; 26:13–18. I.e. within a year of Jesus' death and resurrection. See below, note 46. Cf. Ellis, *History* (note 26), 12; idem, *Making* (note 7), 248–251, 256n; idem, *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society*, 5th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2005), 91ff.

[42] Excepting a brief interlude at Jerusalem (AD 36); Gal 1:18ff.; Acts 9:23–30.

[43] Gal 1:21; 2:1; Acts 9:23–30; 11:25–30; 12:25. Cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 9), 256ff.; idem *Interpreters* (note 10), 15ff. For Luke 'a whole year' (Acts 11:26) may simply mean 'a long time' (Haenchen, note 18, 367 = GT: 311). On John Knox's hypothesis of a mission to Greece between AD 36–45 cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 7), 253f.

[44] Cf. Haenchen (note 18), 624f. = GT: 553f.: For anyone who accepts van Unnik's argument, 'the Hellenistic influence on Paul operated only after his conversion …' (525n = GT: 463n).

[45] For the chronology of Paul's subsequent missions see Ellis, *Making* (note 7), 256–263, 266–284.

As argued above, Paul's background lies in Jerusalem, virtually from infancy and probably until his conversion at about thirty years of age.[46] His knowledge of Greek was gained there, in a bilingual home or in a Jewish school. It probably embraced the Greek Old Testament and other Jewish Greek writings. His rabbinical education in Hebrew under Gamaliel I would have included a biblical rhetoric of preaching and exposition of Scripture, a rhetoric that originated in or was influenced by (Alexandrian Jewish) Greek rhetoric.[47] But it is unlikely that his education included pagan Greek literature or training in Graeco-Roman rhetoric.

[46] A reasoned conjecture: (1) At the martyrdom of Stephen Luke identifies Paul then as a 'young man' (νεανίας, Acts 7:58). This term could range in meaning from those twenty-four to forty years of age (BDAG, 667). But Luke later uses this term interchangeably with 'lad' (παῖς, Acts 20:9, 12). In the LXX it sometimes renders בחור which often refers 'to a young man not yet married' (C. K. Barrett [note 18], I, 386). Cf. Judg 14:10; Ruth 3:10; Isa 62:5; Jer 15:8; Amos 2:11; II Macc 7:25; IV Macc 8:3f.; cf. Isa 23:4; Jer 6:11; 9:21; 51:22; Lam 1:18; 2:21; Ezek 9:6; Amos 9:13; Zech 12:21. (2) Earlier Luke dates the beginning of Jesus' public ministry at 'about 30 years of age' (Luke 3:23). (3) The Levites entered their priestly duties at age thirty (Num 4:3, 23, 30, 35, 39). (4) It is 'from this age [of thirty] onwards, as a rule, that the [Roman] laws call to the magistracies and to the administration of public affairs …' (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman History* 4, 6, 3, Loeb). (5) If Paul was converted in AD 33 at c. thirty years of age he would have been c. sixty-five years old at his final journey to Rome and to martyrdom in AD 67–68; cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 7), 256–263; 266–284.

[47] So, D. Daube, 'Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric' (1949), 'Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis' (1953), *DCW*, I, 333–376, cf. 242: '… from, say, 150 B.C., the teaching of the [Hellenistic] rhetorical schools pervaded the entire Mediterranean world; so that in most branches of learning, up to a point at least, the same spirit and, above all, the same technique might be found everywhere.' Cf. idem, II, 3 f.; H. Thyen, *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie* (Göttingen, 1955). Further, S. Lieberman, 'How Much Greek in Jewish Palestine?' *Biblical and Other Studies*, ed. A. Altmann (Cambridge, MA, 1963), 123–135. See also S. Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*, 2 vols. (Hildesheim, 1964 [1898]); the use of Greek names and tombstone-inscriptions in Palestinian Judaism in, e.g. van der Horst (note 31); J.N. Sevenster, *Do You Know Greek?* (Leiden, 1968). But see Y. Shavit, *Athens in Jerusalem*, 2nd edn. (London, 1999), 319–327.

Paul as a Jewish Christian Prophet

Other issues concerning the question of Graeco-Roman rhetoric in the Pauline corpus must be treated more briefly. As for the presence of rhetorical terminology or compositional structure in Paul's letters, one must determine whether such terms[48] or structures[49] are used in a technical rhetorical sense or in another or more general sense. When, for example, athletic terminology is used in a technical sense in I Corinthians,[50] the connotation is made clear by the context; terminology identified as 'rhetorical' has no clear or necessary technical connotation. As Raymond Brown commented, '… caution is indicated about attempts to detect sophisticated rhetorical patterns. There is no way to be sure that Paul would have been aware of the classic analyses of rhetoric and/or would have been consciously following them.'[51]

Rhetoric in ancient Hellenism referred to speech, not to letters.[52] It may be applied to Paul's letters, however, in that they depart from ancient letters in length,[53] structure and style and resemble them only in their general framework – opening, body, closing. They are, in fact, teaching pieces adapted to a general letter format. The major Pauline letters include what are arguably summaries of sermons[54]

[48] Of some sixteen rhetorical terms in I Corinthians only two, διαίρεσις (12:4 ff.) and σημεῖον (1:22; 14:22), have any similarity with their rhetorical usage. Cf. R. D. Anderson Jr., *The Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms* (Leuven, 2000); idem (note 9), 335–338; M. E. Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 2000), II, 924n.

[49] So, for I Corinthians, esp. Mitchell, *Paul* (note 12). For Galatians cf. her teacher, H. D. Betz, *Galatians* (Philadelphia, 1979). Mitchell's work is reviewed with appreciation by Anderson (note 9), 254–265, but with the negative conclusion 'that comprehensive rhetorical analysis of the argumentation of this letter is not feasible' (264).

[50] E.g. ἀγωνίζεσθαι, πυκτεύειν, στέφανος, τρέχειν (I Cor 9:24ff.).

[51] R. E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York, 1997), 412.

[52] Cf. Anderson, 'Relation of Rhetoric to Epistolography' (note 9), 109–127, whose argument on this matter I generally agree with and follow. He notes 'that ancient rhetorical theorists paid virtually *no* attention to letter writing before the fourth century AD …' (118). On rhetoric in Graeco-Roman education cf. Y. L. Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden, 2001), 85–109, 271–287, 340–372.

[53] Cf. Richards, *Secretary* (note 37), 213.

[54] I.e. homilies, some of which are summaries of biblical commentary preached earlier in Christian synagogues, e.g. Rom 4:1–25 (Michel); Gal 3:6–14, 26–28; 4:21–31 (Borgen, Ellis). Cf. Borgen (note 36), 48–52; Ellis, *Making* (note 7), 101f.; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 5th edn. (Göttingen, 1978), 160f.

and debates[55] that Paul had voiced earlier in Antioch[56] and elsewhere.[57] These summaries are structured, however, not according to Greek rhetoric[58] but in the patterns of proem[59] and yelammedenu-like[60] midrashim found in somewhat different, more stylized form in later rabbinic writings.[61]

Paul's writing is that of a Jewish prophet, an apostolic New Testament prophet, but nonetheless a prophet.[62] Like that of Old Testament prophets, it may be analyzed rhetorically,[63] but it is an approach and has a frame of reference quite different from Graeco-Roman rhetoric. In this context, G. A. Kennedy writes, 'Christian preaching is … not persuasion but proclamation, and is based on authority and grace, not on proof.' Indeed, I Cor 2:6–13, 'may be said to reject the whole of classical philosophy and rhetoric.'[64]

[55] Both with Jewish inquirers or opponents in synagogue schools and with pagan Gentiles, e.g. Rom 1:18–32 (Michel; cf. Acts 17:22–31, Gärtner). Cf. H. Bloedhorn *et al*., 'The Synagogue,' Davies (note 17), III, 267–297, 292ff.; Michel (note 54), 96f.; B. Gärtner, *The Aeropagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (Uppsala, 1955), 144–169.

[56] I.e. in the debates with Judaizers preceding the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem AD 49–50; cf. Gal. 2:11–16.; Ellis, *Making* (note 7), 255–260.

[57] E.g. at Ephesus where Paul ministered at length (AD 53–56) before his first letter to Corinth (AD 56) and his letter to the Romans (AD 58) in which such biblical commentary, i.e. midrash appears. Cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 7), 60, 78–81, 260–266.

[58] Cf. e.g. C. F. G. Heinrici, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen, 1896), 31f.

[59] E.g. Rom 4:1–25; I Cor 1:18–31; 2:6–16; 10:1–13; Gal 3:6–14; 4:21–31. Cf. Ellis, *Prophecy* (note 1), 155f. 213–217; idem, 'Traditions' (note 38), 490f.; idem, *History* (note 26), 107; idem, *Making* (note 7), 78–81, 96, 101ff.; idem, *Old Testament* (note 31), 98f.; Borgen (note 36), 48–52.

[60] Cf. Rom 9:6–29; perhaps, e.g. Rom 11:1–36. Cf. Ellis, *Prophecy* (note 1), 154f., 158f., 218ff.; idem, *Old Testament* (note 31), 97f., idem, *History* (note 26), 106–109; idem, *Making* (note 7), 175f.

[61] Cf. e.g. W. G. Braude, *Pesikta Rabbati*, 2 vols. (New Haven, CT, 1968), I, 2ff., 17–20; J. Townsend, *Midrash Tanhuma*, 2 vols. (Hoboken, NJ, 1997), I, xi, passim. For halachic midrash at Qumran cf. 4Q249 ('Midrash on the Book of Moses').

[62] Cf. I Cor 2:16; 9:1–3; 14:37; II Thess 2:15 with I Thess 2:13. For a comparison of the gifts of apostle and of prophet cf. Ellis, 'The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts,' *Prophecy* (note 1), 129–144, 141ff.

[63] Cf. on Jer 14:2–15:9 Y. Gitay, 'Rhetorical Criticism and Prophetic Discourse,' *Persuasive Artistry. FS G. A. Kennedy*, ed. D. F. Watson (Sheffield, 1991), 13–24; H. Viviers, 'Elihu (Job 32–37), Garrulous but Poor Rhetor … ?' in S. E. Porter, *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture* (Sheffield, 1997), 137–153. M. Avioz, 'A Rhetorical Analysis of Jeremiah 7:1–15,' *TB* 57 (2006), 173–189.

[64] G. A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1980), 127, 131f. Otherwise: J. R. Levison, 'Did the Spirit Inspire Rhetoric?' in Watson (note 63), 25–40.

Elsewhere, he classifies much of Scripture as a 'distinctive religious rhetoric' in which the proclamation is given a supporting reason and which, in Paul's writings, would involve 'some understanding of classical rhetoric.' This rhetoric, however, only described and classified the 'universal fact of human communication.'[65] If so, in what way are the classifications of Greek rhetoric useful for and in what way a distraction from understanding Paul's letters?

Revelation and Rhetoric in I Corinthians

Let us return to the example of I Corinthians with which this chapter began. According to W. Wuellner, 'the reported bickerings in Christian Corinth, which continued for some time in one way or another as attested in I Clement [3:2ff.; 44:1–6; 47:5ff.], were inspired and shaped not by current preoccupations with sophistic rhetoric in Hellenistic Corinth, but by halakic and haggadic discussions in Jewish Corinth, as elsewhere throughout the Dispersion.'[66] This view is supported by several considerations: (1) The essential Jewishness of Paul's argumentation throughout the letter is evident from his frequent use of the Old Testament to support his views[67] and from the midrashic structure of I Cor 1–4 and 10:1–22.[68]

[65] G. A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1984), 6, 10: In so far as this is the case, its classifications may be used to interpret, e.g. II Corinthians (86–96) and Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans (141–160) as well as the Gospels and Acts.

[66] W. A. Wuellner, 'Haggadic Homily Genre in I Corinthians 1–3,' *JBL* 89 (1970), 199–204, 202f. Although he has pursued rhetorical studies, his doubts about its accomplishments remain: There is 'the growing realization that all efforts of applying the standards of rhetorical genres of Hellenistic antiquity to first-century Jewish and Christian texts, as Klaus Berger [*Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, Heidelberg, 1984] attempted, have ended more in frustration, dissatisfaction and obfuscation than in clarification of the task at hand' (W. Wuellner, 'The Rhetorical Genre of Jesus' Sermon in Lk 12:1–13:9,' in Watson [note 63], 91–118, 97f.).

[67] E.g. I Cor 1:19f., 31; 2:9, 16; 3:19f.; 6:16; 9:9; 10:7, 26; 14:21; 15:27, 32, 45, 54f. Cf. Ellis, *Paul's Use* (note 31), 172–176, passim. Further, P. J. Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law* (Assen, 1990), 68–87.

[68] Cf. Wuellner, 'Homily' (note 66); Ellis, 'Traditions' (note 38), 490f.; idem, *Making* (note 7), 78–81; idem, *Prophecy* (note 1), 155f., 213–220; idem, *History* (note 26), 107f., 148;

(2) The church in Corinth, as it is presented in Acts, originated in AD 51–52 and was initially composed largely of Jews and God-fearers[69] within the Jewish synagogue. At the time of I Corinthians (AD 56) it also exhibited a membership of 'both Jews and Greeks' (1:24), circumcised and uncircumcised (7:18). (3) It presumably understood Paul's Old Testament/Jewish references, e.g. Christ as our 'Passover' (5:7), the Exodus Jews as 'our fathers' (10:1), the church implicitly as spiritual Israel in contrast to 'Israel according to the flesh' (τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα, 10:18)[70] and its communion meal as a 'new covenant' with Israel (11:25; cf. Jer 31:31; Lk 22:20). (4) Joined to and participating in a Jewish Messiah (Χριστός), the church in Corinth was viewed by Paul and, if perceptive, rightly viewed itself as Messianic or, what David Daube called, New Testament Judaism.[71]

The Apostle was not an accomplished rhetorician, neither in Luke's presentation of him in Acts[72] nor by his own statements in his letters.[73] In I Corinthians, his negative reference to a 'wisdom of word' (1:17), however, is broader than human rhetoric and is explained as 'the wisdom of the world' (1:20; cf. 2:6) and the 'wisdom of men' (2:5), i.e. human wisdom as such, whether it is mediated philosophically, rhetorically or in any other way. He contrasts this 'foolishness' (3:18) with 'the wisdom of God' (1:21, 24; 2:7), not a wisdom that man achieves or can achieve but a divine wisdom that one receives from the revelation of God through prophets.[74] That Paul uses reason and experience and epistolary and

idem, *Old Testament* (note 31), 96–100; W. A. Meeks, '"And Rose up to Play:" Midrash and Parenesis in I Corinthians 10:1–22,' *In Search of the Early Christians* (New Haven, CT, 2002), 139–152.

[69] Acts 18:1–8, 7. Cf. Schürer (note 29), III, 25f., 160–172.

[70] Cf. Gal 6:16. Even I Cor 12:2 may apply to God-fearers and to their pagan status prior to their commitment to the God of the Old Testament.

[71] D. Daube, *New Testament Judaism* (note 47), title of volume II, *DCW.*

[72] Paul in Acts cannot hold his audience (22:22; 23:1f.), impresses others as absurd or mad (17:32; 26:24) and frightens his friends with a proposal to speak to a hostile crowd (19:30f.). Cf. Ellis, 'The Origin and Making of Luke-Acts,' *Making* (note 7), 377–405, 399.

[73] II Cor 11:6; cf. 10:10.

[74] Cf. E. E. Ellis, 'The Role of the Prophet in the Quest for Truth,' *Christ* (note 1), 255–278; W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 4 vols. (Neukirchen, 2001), I, 168ff.

hermeneutical conventions to mediate this divine wisdom is evident, but he views them as subordinate instruments totally dependent for their success on God's choosing (ἐκλέγεσθαι, 1:27f.) and on God's 'revealing through the Spirit' (2:10) the things of God. It may be that some of the Corinthians expected Paul to deliver his message in terms of sophistic philosophical methods or rhetorical conventions.[75] If so, Paul's 'coming and conduct' at Corinth and his letters to Corinth may be understood in part as an implicit critique of the Corinthian sophistic tradition.[76]

Conclusion

In conclusion, (1) Paul viewed Graeco-Roman philosophy and rhetoric as manifestations of human wisdom that God has rejected, and that Paul also rejects, as instruments 'to save those who believe' (I Cor 1:20f.). (2) His direct training was not in Greek rhetoric but rather in Palestinian Jewish rabbinic hermeneutic even if its form and methods had themselves been indirectly influenced by Greek rhetoric, i.e. in some measure through Alexandrian Judaism.[77] (3) Although Paul used the general epistolary conventions common to his day and secretaries whose style may have been influenced by Greek rhetorical skills, it is unlikely, in the light of his background and training, that the Apostle composed the form or content of his epistles in the fashion of Graeco-Roman rhetoric.

The rhetorical analysis of Paul's letters is in principle correct. But it cannot be accomplished by currently popular interpretations based solely and directly on Graeco-Roman texts and handbooks, an often-used approach that in my judgment is an historically problematic enterprise. To be successful, it needs to be inclusive of the Apostle's Jewish background and to pay attention to the Dead Sea Scrolls, targumic and rabbinic traditions, and to pre-Christian

[75] This argument is made in considerable detail by B. W. Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists* (Cambridge, 1997), 114–244. On the sophistic movements cf. 'Second Sophistic,' 'Sophists,' *OCD*, 3rd edn., 1377f., 1442.

[76] Winter (note 75), 179–202. similar, A. D. Clarke, 'The Sophistic Background to Σοφία,' *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth* (Leiden, 1993), 112ff.

[77] See above, note 47.

Jewish Greek writings as the major media through which the Graeco-Roman literary techniques came (indirectly) to bear upon Paul and upon his epistles.

6

Dynamic Equivalence Theory, Feminist Ideology and Three Recent Bible Versions

God's sovereignty in the mediation of his written revelation through prophets and apostles also involves the words that they use.[1] This is presupposed by Christ and by his apostles when they base their commentary and arguments for a particular interpretation of Scripture on the specific word in the biblical text. For example, Jesus asks the Pharisees how David, who is recognized to be the Messiah's forefather, can refer to the Messiah as his Lord[2] at Ps 110:1: 'the

[1] I.e. verbal inspiration, not that they are the only words that may have been used but that the words used are adequate, at the will of the Holy Spirit, to convey the divine revelation within them. Cf. e.g. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 6th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003 [1957]), 20–37; idem, 'The Authority of Scripture: Critical Judgments in Biblical Perspective,' *Evangelical Quarterly* 39 (1967), 196–204, 202ff.; idem, 'How the New Testament Uses the Old,' *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*, 6th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 147–172, 148f.; idem, 'The Role of the Prophet in the Quest for Truth,' *Christ and the Future in New Testament History*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2001), 255–278, 275f.; idem, *History and Interpretation in New Testament Perspective*, 2nd edn. (Atlanta, 2006), 100f., 123; B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Phillipsburg, NJ, 1999 [1948]), 108f., 299–348; J. I. Packer, 'Inspiration,' *NBD*, 507f.; G. W. Bromiley, 'Inspiration, History of: Reformation,' *ISBE* II, 851ff. See below, note 17.

[2] Mt 22:41–46, 44 T + Q. Cf. Ellis, *Christ* (note 1), 41f.; idem, *Prophecy* (note 1), 153n, 162, 193f.; idem, *History* (note 1), 105, 111; idem, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity*, 3rd edn. (Eugene, OR, 2003), 100.

LORD said to my Lord.' The force of his argument depends on the words 'my Lord.'[3] Similarly, Paul argues from the generic and corporate singular 'seed' (זרע/σπέρμα) at Gen 17:8 that the promise to Abraham's 'seed' refers to Christ and to those who are within the corporate Christ.[4] One observes from these and other cited biblical texts that the precise wording of Scripture is often quite significant for its meaning. Do modern Protestant evangelical versions of the Bible reflect this faithfulness to the scriptural text?

Two Philosophies of Translation

Modern English versions of the Scriptures follow one of two philosophies of translation. The first, a traditional formal equivalence or 'essentially literal' procedure, translates as closely as possible the original words and phrases with precise equivalents in English. Among modern versions it is probably best represented by the *New King James Version* (*NKJV*).[5] This formal equivalence translation is verbally more accurate and, as such, it keeps ambiguous in the translation terms and phrases that are ambiguous or undefined in the original, e.g. 'those of the circumcision' (Acts 11:2 *NKJV*) or 'Put off the old man … [and] put on the new man' (Eph 4:22, 24 *NKJV*; cf. Rom 13:14), and it leaves it to the modern commentator and preacher to define and explain them.

The recently published *English Standard Version* (*ESV*), although not as verbally precise as the *NKJV*, also for the most part follows a formal equivalence principle of translation.[6] An adaptation of the *Revised Standard Version* (*RSV*), it appears to be (on my partial reading) a generally good rendering and an improvement on the *RSV*.

[3] The traditioned Davidic authorship of Ps 110 is assumed. LORD, in small caps, refers to Yahweh (יהוה), God's 'personal' name.

[4] Gal 3:16, 29. Cf. R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (Dallas, TX, 1990), 131f.

[5] *The Holy Bible. New King James Version* (Nashville, TN, 1982).

[6] *The Holy Bible: English Standard Version* (Wheaton, IL, 2001).

A second procedure in translation follows the dynamic (or functional) equivalence theory and transforms, if need be, the original into what the translator believes would be an equivalent idiom in the modern language and culture. It is represented by, among others, the *New International Version* (*NIV*) in which the translator takes on the role of interpreter and commentator. Dynamic equivalence translation is more pleasing and understandable to the modern ear, but it often tends to be more a paraphrase or a targum than a translation of the biblical text. And it downplays the significance and the relevance of the ancient culture and context, the 'salvation history,' for the divine message of the Bible. In the *NIV*, it also opened the way for a more dramatic departure from a formal equivalence translation, apparent in the 1996 *New International Version. Inclusive Language Edition* (*NIVI*) or what might be better termed feminist edition, published in Britain, which made its American debut in 2002 as *Today's New International Version* (*TNIV*).[7]

Biblical Paraphrase Serving Feminist Ideology

It is clear that feminist ideology, in its rejection of the generic use of 'man' and of masculine pronouns, has shaped the *TNIV*. It is present both in deletions and in alterations of masculine references, sometimes even those referring to Jesus,[8] that obscure or foreclose both the specific meaning and the range of meaning in the biblical text.[9]

[7] *The Holy Bible: New International Version. Inclusive Language Edition* (London, 1996); *Today's New International Version* (Grand Rapids, 2005). In traditional standard English, and in the biblical languages, masculine terms are often generic, inclusive of male and female. It is basic to feminist ideology that masculine terms can never be inclusive or generic. Cf. V. C. Phillips, 'Feminist Interpretation,' *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, 2 vols., ed. J. H. Hayes (Nashville, TN, 1999), I, 392. See above, chapter 4, p. 75, note 175.

[8] E.g. Mt 11:19; I Cor 15:21; Phil 2:7(8); cf. Jn 3:27; 8:17; 16:21; Eph 2:15.

[9] E.g. in the New Testament Mt 19:6, 'let not man separate' (*ESV*), leaves open a corporate ('mankind') or an individual (the husband) interpretation. The *TNIV*'s 'let no one' eliminates the corporate and obscures a possible reference to the husband, who in Judaism was

Hundreds of examples could be offered,[10] but two passages may serve to illustrate such differences between the *ESV* and the *TNIV*:

ESV	*TNIV*
Mark 2:27:	
The Sabbath was made for man …	The Sabbath was made for people …
So the Son of Man is Lord	So the Son of Man is Lord
Even of the Sabbath.	Even of the Sabbath.
I Tim 2:5:	
For there is one God	For there is one God
And there is one mediator	And one mediator
Between God and men	Between God and human beings
The man Christ Jesus.	Christ Jesus, himself human.

In Mark 2:27 the *ESV*, by its verbal adherence to the Greek text, retains the corporate, generic and universal sense of 'man' and the link between 'man' and 'Son of Man' that is rooted in rich Old Testament allusions where Hebrew/Aramaic terms for man are used;[11] the *TNIV* paraphrase loses both. At I Tim 2:5 the *ESV* retains the verbal link between all 'men' corporately and the individual 'man' Christ Jesus as well as the biblical language relating

normally the only one who could initiate divorce. Cf. E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 3 vols. in 4, 2nd edn. (Edinburgh, 1973–87), II (1979), 485f. On other matters note the *TNIV*'s paraphrase of οἱ ἁγιοί ('holy ones') as 'believers' (Acts 9:32; Rom 15:31; 16:15) and 'God's people' (e.g. Rom 9:27; 12:15; 16:2; I Cor 6:1, 15).

[10] For the avoidance of the term 'man' in the Gospel of Matthew alone cf. Mt 4:4, 19; 9:8; 10:17, 32f.; 12:12; 13:25; 15:9; 16:23, 26; 19:10, 12, 26; 20:1; 21:25f., 33. Cf. also the paraphrase of ἀνήρ ('man,' 'husband') at Acts 1:16, 2:5, 22, 29; 3:12; 13:16, 26; 17:5, 22; 19:35; 21:28 and its deletion at Acts 10:28; 21:38; 22:12; 23:1, 6, 21. In English the word 'man' may refer specifically to the male or to the individual and the corporate human being, male and female, black and white, old and young. There is no other term fully equivalent to it.

[11] E.g. Dan 7:13; Ezek 1:26; Ps 8:4; Gen 1:27. Cf., together with the literature cited, E. E. Ellis, 'Corporate Personality,' *History* (note 1), 118–120; idem, 'The Corporate Son of Man,' 'The Conceptual Framework of Luke's Eschatology,' 'The Believer's Corporate Existence in Christ,' *Christ* (note 1), 85–88, 112–116, 148–157; idem, 'Corporate Personality,' *Old Testament* (note 2), 110–116; S. A. Son, *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology* (Roma, 2001), 23–28, 63ff., 75–79, 108–111, 117–120, 163–169.

to the male in creation (Adam) and in redemption (Christ).[12] The *TNIV* paraphrase, on the other hand, appears to reflect or to leave itself open to a modern unisex ideology in which the distinctive connotations of masculine and feminine in biblical thought are minimized or merged.[13]

For the Old Testament the situation is the same, e.g.:

ESV	*TNIV*
Ps 1:1	
Blessed is the man Who walks not in the counsel of the wicked	Blessed are those Who do not walk in step with the wicked
Gen 1:27	
God said, 'Let us make man in our image.'	God said, 'Let us make human beings in in our image.'
Ps 8:4	
What is man that you are mindful of him And the son of man that you care for him.	What are mere mortals that you are mindful of them Human beings that you care for them.

A number of North American evangelical Christian denominations, notably the Southern Baptist Convention and the Presbyterian Church in America, have rejected the *TNIV*, and have recommended that their affiliated churches and agencies neither distribute nor use it. Although many biblical scholars also reject the *TNIV* for its theory of translation, denominational and parachurch leaders have done so primarily, it appears, from an instinctive sense that the

[12] Gen 1:27; 2:7–24; Acts 26:23; Rom 5:12–21; I Cor 15:22, 45ff.; I Tim 2:13; Rev 1:5. Cf. Ellis, 'The Priority of the Male in Creation,' *Paul's Use* (note 1), 63f.; idem, 'Paul and the Eschatological Woman,' *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society*, 6th edn. (Eugene, OR, 2005), 53–86, 60f.

[13] Cf. Phillips (note 7), 391f. But see Ellis, 'Gal 3:28;' 'Hermaphroditism in Gal 3:28?' *Theology* (note 12), 78–85; E. L. Miller, 'Is Galatians 3:28 the Great Egalitarian Text? *ET* 114 (2002–2003), 9–11. Otherwise: W. A. Meeks, 'The Image of the Androgyne,' *In Search of the Early Christians* (New Haven, CT, 2002), 3–54; but see Son (note 11), 168–177.

TNIV and its predecessor *NIVI* are translations in the service of a modern ideology.[14] And they do not accept the *apologia* of the *TNIV* translators and publisher that the new version is needed because the standard English of 1960 is no longer understandable or acceptable to English speakers and readers of 2000.

The problem with the *TNIV* is not only its feminist predilection but more significantly its commitment to the theory of 'dynamic equivalence' translation. It is to this broader question that the following observations are made.[15]

Biblical Paraphrase as 'Holy Bible?'

To my mind the 'dynamic equivalence' approach to biblical translation has serious deficiencies. (1) It rejects the verbal aspect of biblical inspiration. (2) It gives to the translator the role that rightly belongs to the preacher, commentator and Christian reader. (3) It assumes that the present-day translator knows what contemporary words, idioms and paraphrases are equivalent to the prophets' and apostles' wording. (4) It advocates conforming biblical language and

[14] The same feminist ideology is followed in the *New Revised Standard Version*. I served for a number of years on the *NRSV* translation committee. On 25 Nov 1980 the Division of Education and Ministry of the National Council of Churches, who owned the copyright to the *RSV* and who commissioned the translation, approved a number of suggestions 'to assist [the Committee] in their task of employing a more inclusive language style.' Over time it became clear that this task was a primary purpose and goal of the version. Cf. *Time Magazine*, 8 Dec 1980, 128; 29 Dec 1980, 2. Apart from gender-related texts, however, the *NRSV* is generally a formal equivalence translation.

[15] For a thorough analysis cf. A. H. Nichols, *Translating the Bible: A Critical Analysis of E. A. Nida's Theory of Dynamic Equivalence and Its Impact upon Recent Bible Translations* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Sheffield UK 1997, abstract: '*Translating the Bible*,' *TB* 50 [1999] 159f.); R. C. Van Leeuwen, 'On Bible Translation and Hermeneutics,' *After Pentecost: Language and Biblical Interpretation. FS A. C. Thiselton*, ed. C. Bartholomew *et al.* (Carlisle, 2001), 284–311. Cf. also V. Poythress and W. Grudem, 'How to Translate,' *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy: Muting the Masculinity of God's Words* (Nashville, TN, 2000), 57–90. Somewhat differently, D. A. Carson, *The Inclusive Language Debate: A Plea for Realism* (Grand Rapids, 1998). More broadly, cf. P. J. Thuesen, *In Discordance with the Scriptures: American Protestant Battles over Translating the Bible* (Oxford, 1999), 145–155. See above, chapter 4, p. 73, note 159.

concepts to the modern culture rather than conforming the modern culture to biblical language and concepts. (5) It appears to discard the Protestant principle that Christian laity should have full access to the Word of God written without interposition of clergy or of paraphrastic veils. Let us look at these matters in detail.

(1) Verbal inspiration means, among other things, that for the New Testament writers the divine message 'breathed-out' (θεόπνευστος) by God through the biblical authors[16] extends to the words that they use.[17] Although many will disagree, I suggest that the revelation is within the word and that the word employed in the Scriptures is adequate to convey the meaning to the Christian reader as God chooses to do so.[18] It was this concept of the sacred word that caused the translators of the *King James Version* (*KJV*) and of the *NKJV* to retain meticulously the Hebrew and Greek wording and to place in italics words or idiom that they thought necessary to add for clarity.[19] All of this vanishes in the dynamic equivalence translation theory. On its logic an Eskimo translation could render 'sheep' as 'seal' since sheep are unknown to the Arctic peoples and since 'seal' is the nearest Eskimo functional equivalent.

(2) The loss of a sense of the sacred 'word' and the recognition that all translation involves some degree of interpretation – word order, syntax, idiom – leads translators who follow this 'dynamic' theory to take on the role of commentators. Some suppose that if Christian apostles or prophets could elaborate the biblical text from, e.g. 'he shall be my son' (II Sam 7:14) to 'you shall be my sons and

[16] II Tim 3:16f.; cf. B. B. Warfield, 'God-Inspired Scripture' (note 1), 245–296.

[17] Cf. Mt 4:4; 5:18; 22:42ff. parr; Gal 3:16; Rev 22:18f.; Ellis, 'The Role of the Prophet in the Quest for Truth,' *Christ* (note 1), 275f.; Warfield (note 1): The New Testament writers regarded Scripture 'as divinely safeguarded in even its verbal expression' (115), and they 'claim verbal inspiration' (423); Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, 1952 [1871]), I, 164f. See above, note 1.

[18] See Ellis, 'The Word of God Hidden and Revealed,' *Christ* (note 1), 273–278.

[19] So, F. F. Bruce, *The King James Version: The First 350 Years* (New York, 1960), 15: 'Words necessary to complete the sense were to be printed in distinctive type.' This was one of the rules laid down for the original edition. It should be noted, however, that the system of italics in *KJV* was challenged by Roman Catholic scholars as early as Alexander Geddes in the late eighteenth century. On his translations cf. F. F. Bruce, 'The English Bible for Roman Catholics,' *History of the Bible in English*, 3rd edn. (New York, 1978), 126.

daughters' (II Cor 6:18),[20] why cannot they do the same? They are not the first transmitters of the Scriptures to think like this.

Some early and medieval copyists and translators of the New Testament also thought that they could alter words and phrases of Holy Scripture, and the whole discipline of textual criticism includes the endeavor to weed out such elaborations in a good number of manuscripts. Earlier such translators and transmitters of the biblical text were, however, more concerned to harmonize than to de-masculinize. But since biblical translators, unlike the biblical authors, are neither prophets nor apostles, should they not refrain from doing either? Valerie B. Makkai, past president of the Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States, puts the issue well:

> If we are going to call the results a 'translation,' then we must *translate* – not rephrase or paraphrase…. [I]t is of utmost importance to me, as a Christian, to know exactly what the Scriptures say …. [I]t is insulting to me as a woman … to insinuate that I cannot appreciate the differences between ancient and modern cultures, that I am incapable of understanding … generic *he*, and that I have to be catered to lest I be offended by such a 'sexist' usage.[21]

(3) Modern translators do not always know what is a contemporary equivalent for a biblical word apart from the word itself. One problem is that all of us today, in some respects, have lost what Harry Blamires called 'a Christian mind' or what might be better termed 'a biblical mind.'[22] Western man is sometimes unable to think biblically, especially in two respects, namely, with respect to anthropology and to society. First, with the triumph of nominalist philosophy in this area he tends to think that only the individual is real and that corporate entities – family, nation, man, body of Christ – are only metaphors or 'collectives.' For biblical teaching, in my judgment, both the corporate and the individual entities are equally real.[23] Formal equivalent translation leaves open that interpretation; dynamic equivalent paraphrase often precludes it.

[20] Cf. Ellis, *Paul's Use* (note 1), 139, 144, 178; idem, *Prophecy* (note 1), 170f.; idem, *The Making of the New Testament Documents*, 2nd edn. (Leiden, 2002), 99f.

[21] 'Foreword,' to Poythress (note 15), xxi f. See above, chapter 4, pp. 75–78.

[22] H. Blamires, *The Christian Mind* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1978 [1963]).

[23] See above, note 11. Cf. J. Klein, 'Nominalismus,' *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 7 vols., ed. H. v. Campenhausen *et al.*, 3rd edn. (Tübingen, 1965), IV, 1505–1508.

Second, the Bible is, socially, a patriarchal book composed in a succession of patriarchal societies. But household relationships are only a small part of biblical teaching on diversity.[24] While Scripture represents all of God's chosen people as equal in value within a diversity of roles, it is also a message in which 'rank' is an essential and an affirmed component of reality.[25] It affirms and transforms the concepts of lordship and servanthood into a positive unity in diversity that is honoring to both estates. Much egalitarian thought in the West, however, rejects such diversities and seeks to eliminate them. This kind of egalitarianism is rooted not in Scripture but, it appears, in the *égalité*, the neo-pagan ideals of the Enlightenment and its aftermath[26] that reduce diversity into a bland uniformity and that sometimes result in a loss of both liberty and equality as seen, for example, in a number of Marxist revolutions. In this respect modern thought stands in stark contrast to the biblical teaching.

If our generation has lost the ability to understand certain biblical terms, the answer is not, I think, to abandon them for paraphrastic 'educated guesses' or for politically correct idiom. It is rather for the translator to stick to transmitting the biblical wording; the preacher and the commentator can then explain the biblical words and idiom in a way that will enable our culture, or at least Christian believers in it, to think biblically and thus be prepared to hear the Word of God, i.e. the true meaning within the biblical words.

(4) A fourth issue that is of considerable relevance is the goal of biblical translation. From a New Testament perspective the Bible is

[24] On New Testament household codes cf. Ellis, *Making* (note 20), 64ff., 110, 134f.

[25] For the New Testament this is seen with reference to parabolic analogies to the kingdom of God (Lk 12:35–44; 19:12–19), to status in it (Mt 20:20–23) and in church ministries (Mt 20:25–28; Lk 22:26f.; Acts 20:17, 28; I Cor 4:1; 9:1–3; 12:28; 16:15f.; I Thess 5:12; I Tim 1:18 with 4:11; 3:1; 5:17; Tit 1:5; I Pet 5:2). Cf. Ellis, 'Charism and Order in Earliest Christianity,' *Making* (note 20), 28ff., 66f.

[26] And of the philosophy that underlay it. Cf. S. E. Finer, *The History of Government from Earliest Times*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1997), I, 29: 'A belief system which envisions the cosmos as arranged in a hierarchy and humans as a part of the cosmos will accept social inequality as natural. A belief system which *per contra* starts with the unproven and unprovable axiom that "all men are created equal, etc." will not accept such inequality gladly, if at all;' See above, chapter 4, note 184, p. 76f. For the influence also of John Locke on the individualism and (a qualified) egalitarianism in early American thought cf. D. L. Dungan, 'John Locke and the Economic Agenda …,' *A History of the Synoptic Problem* (New York, 1999), 279–283.

the church's book, and it can be understood only as the Holy Spirit, who inspired the authors, opens the mind and heart of the modern hearer and reader.[27] In large measure its teachings are to be mediated by gifted teachers whom God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, has placed in the church[28] to expound the Scriptures to Christ's chosen people and thus to aid them in conforming their lives to its precepts.

With this goal in mind the translators of the *KJV*, who were committed to the sacred character of the words of Scripture,[29] provided the church with a Bible that transformed the English language to biblical terms and concepts.[30] Many biblical terms that were strange to its first readers and hearers became over time, through faithful teaching of the Scriptures, part and parcel of common English.[31] The goal and the result of the work of the *KJV* translators was to conform the culture to the Scriptures. In our more secular, i.e. pagan, culture it is even more incumbent upon translators to retain the often strange language of the Bible in order to seek again a similar transformation of our culture. 'Formal equivalence' translation accords with this. 'Functional equivalence' translations, on the other hand, tend to conform the Scripture to the secularist language and culture and in the process to lose in many respects the meaning of the biblical terms, idioms and concepts of the prophets of ancient Israel and of apostolic Christianity in which God chose to give his abiding canonical revelation to his people.

[27] Some in the Protestant heritage thought that human reason alone could perceive the Word of God in Scripture; even B. B. Warfield (note 1, 101) appears at times to reflect this viewpoint, i.e. when he speaks of the '"Word of God" accessible to man.' But the more perceptive writers recognized the necessity of the work of the Holy Spirit to make the meaning of Scripture clear to the believing reader. Cf. Ellis, *Christ* (note 1), 273n.; idem, *Old Testament* (note 2), 81f.; R. Preus, 'The Union of the Word and the Spirit,' *The Inspiration of Scripture* (Edinburgh, 1955), 183–190; H. D. McDonald, *Theories of Revelation: An Historical Study 1700–1966*, 2 vols. in 1, 2nd edn. (Grand Rapids, 1979), II, 362–369, passim.

[28] Cf. Rom 12:3–8; I Cor 12:4–11, 28; Eph 4:7–12; I Pet 4:10–11; cf. Jas 3:1.

[29] Cf. Bruce, *Version* (note 19), 23–28.

[30] On the influence of the *KJV* on English life and literature cf., among others, the older work of C. B. McAfee, *The Greatest English Classic* (New York, 1912). Luther's Bible did something similar for the German language. Further, cf. N. Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (New York, 1982), 5, 207–233.

[31] E.g. 'carnal,' 'flesh-pots,' many terms and concepts in English common law and in English literature.

(5) It is not too much to say, I think, that the 'dynamic equivalence' theory of translating Scripture represents a betrayal of the Protestant principle, going back to Wycliffe and Tyndale, that ordinary Christians should have the right and the opportunity to hear and to read the Word of God in their own tongue. Medieval clerics hid that Word behind a veil of Latin. Modern 'dynamic' translators, not in intention but in result, often veil that Word in a cloud of paraphrase.

Conclusion

Preachers, students and Christian laity may well read with profit many biblical paraphrases as long as they recognize them for what in considerable measure they are, biblical targums or implicit commentaries[32] of one or another group of sincere Christian writers. But to hear best the Word of God in English, one should, one would think, listen to or read a modern version of the Bible that adheres most closely to the terms, idioms and concepts of the original Greek and Hebrew texts. As mentioned above, the *NKJV* probably does so most fully, even if in the New Testament it often follows a manuscript that many contemporary textual critics would regard as secondary.[33] The *ESV* also generally meets these criteria. In my judgment, however, the *TNIV* does not.

[32] Cf. Ellis, 'Implicit Midrash,' *Old Testament* (note 2), 92–96.

[33] Notably the longer ending of Mk 16:9–20; Jn 7:53–8:11 and I Jn 5:7–8. But see W. R. Farmer, *The Last Twelve Verses of Mark* (Cambridge, 1974). The reference edition of the *NKJV* gives in the margin the reading of the most recent critical Greek Testament where it differs from the manuscripts followed by the *NKJV*. For a brief history of New Testament textual criticism from Erasmus to Nestle-Aland cf. Dungan (note 26), 291–301. The issue is sometimes exaggerated. The two extreme opposite manuscript families, the 'Byzantine Imperial text and the Alexandrian Egyptian text … actually exhibit a remarkable degree of agreement, perhaps as much as 80 percent' (K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids 1987, 28); for the other 20% the vast majority of disagreements are misspellings, the repetition or omission of a word or line, or a harmonistic duplication from another New Testament text (cf. Dungan [note 26], 294f.). Furthermore, there is no consensus among textual critics as to which textual family or eclectic combination of manuscripts is closest to the original. Cf. Dungan (note 26), 351–356, and the literature cited; G. D. Kilpatrick, 'The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the *Textus Receptus*,' *The Principles and Practices of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Leuven, 1990): '… at each variation we must look at the readings of the Byzantine manuscripts with the possibility in mind that they may be right' (49). 'No readings can be condemned categorically because they are characteristic of certain manuscripts. We have to pursue a consistent eclecticism' (50).

Index of Passages

I. *Old Testament*

Genesis
1–3 5, 44
1:1–5 45
1:27 99, 100
2:7–24 100
2:8 45
3:2–5 9
3:15 11
3:19 40
9:21–27 78
12:1–3 6, 11
15:5f. 10
15:13f. 10
17:8 97
17:21 ix
19:5–8 78
22:16ff. 10
37:5–9 10
37:40–41 10
37–50 9
40–41 10
50:20 9
50:15–20 10

Exodus
3:10 6
3:15 6
4:10–17 54
4:11–16 80
4:12–16 54
9:16 9
12:3 24
15:20 54
17:14 51
24:4 51
34:5–8 54
34:27 51

Leviticus
10:11 80
18:4 9
18:22f. 78
19:18 77
20:13 78

Numbers
4:3 89
4:23 89
4:30 89
4:35 89
4:39 89
33:2 51

Deuteronomy
11:26ff. 9
18:18 54
18:18–22 80
23:17f. 78
31:9 51
31:9–13 54
31:22 51
31:24 51
33:8ff. 80

Joshua
8:32 51

Judges
5:1–31 51, 54
14:10 89
18:3–6 80
19:16–26 78

Ruth
3:10 89

I Samuel
1:1 55
3:19f. 54
7:9 54
10:1–11 55
10:5 55
10:8 54
10:10 55
10:25 55
12:13ff. 9
16:7–13 ix
16:9–13 11
19:20 55
25:39–42 24

II Samuel
7:11–17 ix
7:12–17 11
7:14 102
10:2–5 24
12:11f. 10
14:17 80
14:20 80
15:13f. 10
16:23 54, 80
23:10ff. 10
24:1 9

I Kings
3:11f. 80
3:12 54
8:16 6
9:4–8 9
13:1–6 10
13:32 10
14:6 24
14:6f. 24
14:24 78
18:4 55
18:13 55
18:36–39 54
20:35 55

21:20ff. 10
22:13–28 10
22:19–23 30
22:34 10
22:37f. 10

II Kings
2:2f. 55
5:22 55
6:1 55
8:12f. 10
9:1 55
10:28 55
10:32 10
22:8ff. 55
22:14 54
23:2f. 55
25:1–12 11
25:27 50

I Chronicles
21:1 9

II Chronicles
17:7 24
36:22f. 10

Ezra
1–6 52
6:15–18 55
7:10 52
7:12 52
7:14 24
7:25 54

Nehemiah
6:14 54
8:4–9 55
8:7ff. 80
9:3 55

Job
1:9–12 9
32–37 91

Psalms
1:1 100
8:3–8 44
8:4 99, 100
14:2f. 9
33:6 44
94:7–11 17
104:24–30 17
110 97
110:1 96
139:1–16 17
139:4–18 11
147:5 11

Proverbs
1:1 54
8:22–31 44

Ecclesiastes
3:1 17
3:11 16
7:20 9
7:23f. 16

Isaiah
1:19f. 9
3:8–26 10
6:1–4 54
6:1–8 30
6:8 24
8:3 54
10:22f. 6
18:1f. 25
18:2 24
23:4 89
40:28 10
42:9 10
44:7 10
44:28 10
45:11 10
46:9f. 10
46:9ff. ix
48:5 10
55:8f 16
60:21f. ix
62:5 89
64:6f. 9

Jeremiah
1:5 6, 10, 21
6:11 89
7:1–15 91
7:5ff. 9
9:21 89
14:2–15:9 91
15:8 89
17:27 10
18:5–17 9
18:18 54, 80
19:13ff. 10
23:18 30
29:10–14 10
31:1 ix
31:31 93
31:31–34 ix
36:4–32 55
51:22 89

Lamentations
1:18 89
2:21 89

Ezekiel
1:26 99
4:1–3 10
9:6 89
36:16–28 ix

Daniel
2:21 80
2:28f. 10, 11
2:48 80
4:18 80
7:13 99
8:9–14 10
9:26f. 10
10:13 8
11:31 10
11:31f. 10
12:4 ix
12:8 ix
12:8ff. ix

12:11 10

Hosea
4:6 80

Amos
2:11 89
9:13 89

Jonah
4:2 14

Zechariah
8:11–12 6
12:21 89

II. *New Testament*

Malachi
2:7 54, 80

Matthew
1–2 72
1:21 38
3:1–17 59
4:1–11 9
4:4 99, 102
4:16 42
4:19 99
5:1–18 11
5:8 17
5:18 102
5:19 76
5:45 17
5:48 5
6:23 42
6:30 17
8:1–4 59
8:14–17 59
8:23–27 59
8:29ff. 17
9:1–8 59
9:8 99
9:11 84
9:18–26 59
10:1 23
10:1f. 27
10:1–16 28
10:5 27
10:15 17
10:17 99
10:22 4, 29
10:29 17
10:32f. 99
10:40 27
11:1 27
11:19 98
11:22ff. 17
11:27 16
11:28 7
12:1–8 59, 84
12:9–14 84
12:12 99
12:22–32 59
12:46–50 59
13:10–12 59
13:10–14 ix
13:25 99
14:13–21 59
15:1–9 84
15:6 ix
15:9 99
16:17 2
16:23 99
16:26 99
17:1–13 59
19:6 98
19:10 99
19:12 99
19:17 9
19:26 99
19:28 76
20:1 99
20:20–23 76, 104
20:25–28 104
21:1–17 59
21:23–27 59
21:25f 99
21:33–46 59
21:33 99
22:14 4, 7
22:15–22 59
22:23–33 59
22:29 ix
22:41–46 59, 96
22:42ff. 102
22:44 96
23:23 84
24:1–36 10, 59
24:15 53
26:21–25 10
26:31–35 10
26:33ff. 16
26:69–75 10
27:3ff. 10
28:9f. 27
28:16–20 27
28:19 7
28:19f. 2

Mark
1:14f. ix
2:27 99
3:13–19 28
6:7–13 28
6:30 28
13:14 53
13:20 6
16:9–20 106

Luke
1–2 60
1:15 21
1:71 38
3:23 89
3:38 44
4:28f. 29
6:12–16 28
7:36–39 84
9:1–6 28
9:12 28
9:23 29
9:30f. ix
9:45 ix
9:51 ix
9:58 29

10:1 27
10:1–20 27, 28
10:1–24 27
10:16 27
10:25–37 77
10:27 77
11:37f. 84
12:35–44 104
13:34 29
14:1–6 84
15:2 84
16:8 42
19:12–19 104
19:43f. 10
21:20–24 10
22:20 93
22:26f. 104
22:28 3
22:28–30 76
22:32 10
23:43 44
24 60
24:30–35 27
24:46ff. 27

John
1:1–5 44, 45
1:18 43
3:5–8 4
3:27 98
5:2 85
6:37 6
6:44 6
6:70f. 10
7:17 15
7:37 7
7:53–8:11 106
8:17 98
9:16 84
10:11 4
10:27ff. 6
13:10f. 10
13:18f. 10
13:20 27
13:21–30 10
15:16 4, 6
15:18–21 29
16:21 98
17:11f. 6
17:18 12
19:13 85
19:17 85
19:20 85
20:16ff. 27
20:21 27
20:24–28 43
20:26–29 27
21:15ff. 27

Acts
1:2 6
1:8 7, 34, 64
1:15–20 10
1:16 99
1:26 28
2:5 99
2:22 99
2:23 11
2:29 99
2:38ff. 38
3:12 99
4:27f. 11
4:32–5:11 77
5:31 2
5:34 25
5:34 f. 88
5:41 29
6:1 44, 67,
77, 85
7:2–53 ix
7:20ff. 84
7:25 38
7:58 88, 89
7:59 85
8:1ff. 88
9:1f. 85
9:1–6 88
9:3–18 88
9:4 18
9:11 83
9:13f. 88
9:15 6
9:15f. 6, 27
9:16 29
9:17 18
9:21 88
9:23–30 88
9:32 99
10:28 99
10:40f. 27
11:2 97
11:2 f. 67
11:18 2
11:25–30 88
11:26 88
11:29f. 64
12:25 64, 88
13:1 28
13:6–10 8
13:6–12 18
13:7 20
13:12 19
13:16 99
13:21 83
13:26 99
13:48 4
14:4 27
14:14 27
14:23 28
15 64
15:2–6 28
15:5 67, 84, 88
15:16ff. 10
15:22f. 28
16:10–17 20
16:37f. 19, 83, 85
17:5 99
17:5–9 20
17:22 99
17:22–31 91
17:28 87
17:31 17
17:32 93
18:1–8 93
18:7 93
18:18 88
19:30f. 93
19:35 99

20:4 20, 35
20:6 35
20:9 89
20:12 89
20:17 104
20:21 2, 7
20:28 28, 104
21:8 60
21:23–26 88
21:28 99
21:38 99
21:39 19, 83, 85
21:40 85, 86
22:2 85, 86
22:3 25, 83, 84
22:4–8 88
22:6–16 88
22:7 18
22:12 99
22:13 18
22:19f. 88
22:21 27
22:22 93
22:25–28 19
22:25–29 85
22:26–29 83
23:1. 99
23:1 f 93
23:6 88, 99
23:21 99
23:23–27:1 60
23:23f. 34
23:27 83, 85
24:27 34
26:4 84
26:5 84
26:5f. 88
26:9ff. 88
26:10 85
26:13–18 88
26:14 18, 85, 86
26:17 27
26:23 100
26:24 93
27:1f. 35
28:16 34
28:23 2
28:30 34

Romans
1:1 27
1:7 65
1:15 65
1:17 47
1:18–32 91
1:26f. 78
1:27 77
2:4 2
2:5 17
2:8f. 46
2:16 17
2:19 42
3:9–19 15
3:22ff. 40
4:1–25 90, 91
5–8 41
5:6 ix
5:10 5, 45
5:12 3, 39
5:12–21 39, 44, 100
5:14 3
5:17 39
5:19 39
6 40
6:3f. 6
6:5 3
6:6 3, 40
6:8 3
6:11 40
6:17f. 15
6:20 5, 15
6:21f. 37
6:22 15
6:23 46
7:4 40
7:22–25 5
8:1 3, 41
8:17 29
8:23 42
8:29 42
8:29 f. 6, 18, 41
8:33 6, 40
9:5 43
9:6–29 61, 91
9:10–18 6
9:11 6
9:17 9
9:17–24 17
9:22f. 5
9:27 6, 99
10:9 43
10:13 43
10:17 2
11:1 83
11:1–36 91
11:5ff. 6
11:30 37
11:33 16
11:36 37
12:1 5
12:3–8 105
12:6 28
12:15 99
13:2 28
13:9 28
13:12 42
13:14 97
14:1–5 28
14:23 15, 65
14:39 28
15:24 33
15:31 99
15:33 65
16:2 99
16:7 26
16:15 99
16:21 20
16:22 87

I Corinthians
1–4 82, 92
1:1 27
1:17 93
1:18–31 91
1:18–3:20 15
1:19f. 92
1:20 93

1:20 f. 94
1:21 93
1:22 90
1:23 29
1:24 44, 93
1:27f. 6, 94
1:27–29 6
1:31 92
2:2 29
2:5 93
2:6 93
2:6–13 91
2:6–16 88, 91
2:7 93
2:9 17, 86, 92
2:10 94
2:16 91, 92
3:5–15 28
3:17 5
3:18 93
3:19 86
3:19 f. 92
4:1 104
4:3f. 29
4:8–13 29
4:16 29
5:7 93
6:1 99
6:9f. 78
6:15 99
6:16 92
7:11 45
7:14 3
7:18 93
8:6 37, 38
9:1 27
9:1–3 29, 76, 91, 104
9:7 28
9:9 92
9:20 88
9:24ff. 90
10:1 93
10:1–13 91
10:1–22 92, 93
10:7 92
10:18 93
10:26 92
11:1 29
11:5 54
11:7ff. 44
11:25 93
12:2 93
12:4 28, 90
12:4ff. 90
12:4–11 105
12:10 29
12:28 28, 76, 104, 105
13:9–12 8
13:14 97
14:14 28
14:18f. 28
14:21 92
14:22 90
14:29 29
14:34f. 54
14:37 28, 91
15:1–58 82
15:3–8 27
15:5–8 27
15:9 88
15:21 98
15:22 3, 39, 40, 44, 100
15:22 f. 12
15:23 39
15:27 92
15:32 34, 92
15:33 87
15:42–49 42
15:45–57 12
15:45 44, 92
15:45ff. 100
15:53–57 17
15:54 86
15:54 f. 92
16:15f. 104

II Corinthians
1:1 27
1:12 15
3:6 28
3:14f. ix
3:16ff. 43
4:4 43
4:6 42
4:7–12 29
5:18ff. 45
6:4 28
6:4–10 29
6:14 42
6:14–7:1 88
6:18 17, 103
8:15 86
8:23 26
10–13 66
10:10 93
11:3 9, 44
11:6 93
11:22 85
11:23 34
11:23–30 29
11:24 88
12:2f. 30
12:7f. 9
12:12 28, 30

Galatians
1:1 27
1:13 88
1:15 21
1:15f. 4, 6, 18, 27, 88
1:18ff. 88
1:21 88
1:23 88
2 64
2:1 88
2:1–10 64
2:9 70
2:11–16 91
2:19f. 40
2:20 3
3:6–14 90, 91

3:16 12, 97, 102
3:22 15
3:26–28 90
3:27 6
3:28 76, 100
3:29 12, 97
4:4 ix, 12
4:8f. 37
4:14 27
4:21–31 90, 91
4:29 4
5:22 39
6:16 93

Ephesians
1:1 27, 65
1:3–14 35, 36
1:4 3, 4, 6, 17
1:4f. 4
1:11 3, 6, 11
2 41
2:1–3 15
2:5 40
2:5f. 40
2:8–10 2
2:15 98
2:16 37, 45
4:7–12 105
4:8 86
4:11 28
4:22 97
4:22–24 5
4:24 97
4:25–5:14 35
5:8 42
5:27 5
6:12 42
6:20 33
6:21 34, 35

Philippians
1:1 28
1:6 4
1:10 33
1:13 33
1:17 33
1:29 29
2:6–11 35, 88
2:7 98
2:8 98
2:9ff. 43
2:25 26
3:5 83, 84, 85
3:5f. 85
3:6 88
3:8–11 29
3:12 39
3:18f. 46
4:10 39

Colossians
1:1 27, 35
1:2 31
1:8 39
1:9 35
1:9ff. 35
1:9–11 35
1:12 35
1:12–14 35, 36, 37, 38, 39 40, 45
1:12–20 31, 35, 38, 46
1:13 31, 38, 41
1:13 f. 36
1:14 35, 38, 41
1:15 36, 38, 42
1:15–17 43
1:15–18 44
1:15–19 43
1:15–20 35, 36, 37, 38 42, 44, 45
1:16 36, 37, 43
1:16f. 37
1:17 36, 43
1:18 36, 37, 45
1:19 36
1:20 37, 45, 46
1:20f. 45
1:21 5
1:21 f. 37
1:21ff. 31
1:22 37
1:23ff. 28
1:24 29, 37
2:5 38
2:10 37
2:11 37
2:12 3
2:17ff. 37
2:19 37
3:1–14 5
3:3 3
3:12 6, 40
3:16 31
3:18–4:1 35
4:3 33
4:7 34, 35
4:9 34
4:14 20, 35
4:16 31, 53
4:18 33

I Thessalonians
1:1 87
1:4 6
1:6 29
2:13 27, 91
2:14 29
5:12 104
5:20 28
5:27 53

II Thessalonians
1:1 87
1:5f. 29
1:5–10 17
1:7ff. 46
2:8–11 46
2:13 2
2:15 91
3:7ff. 29

I Timothy
1:1 27
1:9f. 78

1:13 88
1:18 28, 104
2:5 99
2:7 28
2:8–3:1 44
2:13 100
3:1 104
3:1 f. 28
4:1–5 8
4:11 104
4:14 28
5:17 104
5:17ff. 28
6:16 17

II Timothy
1:1 27
1:6 28
1:8 33, 34
1:11 28
1:16f. 34
2:9 33
2:19 86
2:25 2
2:25f. 15
3:12 29
3:16f. 102
4:6ff. 34
4:11 20

Titus
1:1 27
1:5 104
1:5–9 28
1:7 28
1:12 87
2:13 43

Philemon
1 35
9 33
10ff. 34
22 34
23 33
24 20, 35

Hebrews
1:2 44
6:17 10

James
1:9 77
1:13ff. 9
1:27 77
2:1–8 77
2:5 6
3:1 105
5:1–5 77
5:14 28

I Peter
1:1f. 4, 6, 10
1:5 ix
1:15f. 5
1:23 4
2:9 17, 42
4:10–11 105
5:1f. 28
5:2 28, 104

II Peter
1:4 17
2:4 17
2:6–8 78
2:9 17
2:13f. 78
2:17 42
3:2–13 ix
3:9 9

I John
1:5–8 42
5:7–8 106
5:19 15

II John
1 28

III John
1 28

Jude
7f. 78

Revelation
1:5 100
1:8 17
2:10 29
2:20 54
4:8 17
7:8 83
7:12 17
9:11 85
11:16ff. ix
11:17 17
12:7 8
12:9 9
15:3 17
16:5ff. 17
16:7 17
16:14 17
16:16 85
17:14 6
19:6 17
19:15 17
21:22 17
22:15 78
22:17 4, 7
22:18f. 1

III. *Apocrypha*

I Maccabees
9:27 56

II Maccabees
7:25 89

IV Maccabees
8:3f. 89

Sirach
1:4 45
1:9 45
24:1–7 45

Wisdom
7:27 45

IV. *Dead Sea Scrolls*

1QS	3:13	42
	3:20f.	42
1QH	12:11ff	80
	20:11ff	80
1QM	1:1	42
	13:5	42
	13:10ff.	42
4Q249		91
CD-A	11:2	24
	11:18ff.	24

V. *Philo and Josephus*

Philo		
in Flaccum	158	84
de Leg. Alleg.	I, 43	45
de Leg. ad Gaium	I, 99	84
Vita Mosis	2, 7	57
	2, 37–40	57
Sacrifices	3, 8	45

Josephus		
War	2, 162	84
	6, 358–442	11
	7. 150	55
Antiquities	3, 38	55
	4, 303f.	51,55
	5, 61	55
	20, 263ff.	86
Against Apion	I, 38–41	56
	I, 41f.	56
Vita	191	84

VI. *Ancient Christian Writings*

Acts of Paul	11:1–5	34
Acts of Peter	1:1–3	34

Clement of Rome		
I Clement	3:2ff.	92
	5:6ff.	34
	5:7	34
	44:1–6	92
	47:5ff.	92

Clement of Alexandria		
Stromata	1, 1	32

Epiphanius		
Panarion	26, 11, 8	77
	26, 13, 1	77
	30, 11, 1ff.	26

Eusebius		
Historia Ecclesiastica	3, 25, 4–7	68
	4, 22, 6	23
	6, 12, 3	68
	9, 10, 1	84

Irenaeus		
Against Heresies	3, 14, 1	32

Jerome		
de virus illustribus	5	20
	5:1ff.	19
ad Philemon	23	20
Justinian		
Institutes	3, 26	23
Justin		
Dialogue	17:1	25
	7:3	24
Tertullian		
de Carne Christi	2, 15	23
Against Heretics	30	13
Adversum Marcionem	5, 19	32

VII. *Rabbinic Writings*

Midrash		
Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael: Pisha 3	3	24
Mishnah		
Berakoth	5:5	24
Yoma	1:5	25
Rosh Hashanah	1:3	25, 26
	4:9	24, 25
Sotah	9:14	86
Gittin	4:1	24, 2
Kiddushin	3:1	25
Pirke Aboth	1:1	57
	3:15	12
Tosefta		
Sotah	13:2 (3)	57
Abodah Zarah	1:20	86
Babylonian Talmud		
Sotah	49b	86
Gittin	58a	86
Kiddushin	29a	85
Baba Kamma	82b–83a	86
Sanhedrin	11a	57
Menahoth	64b	86

VIII. *Graeco-Roman Writings*

Aratus		
Phaenomena	5	87
Aurelius		
Meditations	4, 23	45
Demosthenes		
Orator	3, 5	21
	18, 80	21
Dionysius Halicarnassus		
Roman History	4, 6, 3	89
	9, 59, 2	21
Epictetus		
Discourses	3, 22, 46	22
Gaius		
Institutes	3, 155–162	23
Herodotus		
History	1, 21	21
	5, 38	21
Juvenal		
Satires	5, 127	19

Pliny the Younger
Letters 10, 5 20
10, 6 20
10, 11 20

Suetonius
Julius Caesar 29, 1 19
Augustus 19, 1 19
64, 1 19

Tacitus
Annals 15, 44 9
Histories 4, 13, 1 20

This page intentionally left blank

Index of Authors

Aalers, G. C. 48, 50, 72
Agnew, F. H. 22, 23
Aitken, K. T. 80
Aland, Barbara 87, 106
Aland, Kurt 65, 66, 87, 106
Albright, W. F. 50
Aletti, J. N. 36
Alexander, J. A. . 72
Alexander, L. 82
Alexander, P. S. 69, 86
Alford, H. 41, 84
Allis, O. T. 48, 50
Altmann, A. 89
Amador, J. D. H. 82
Anderson, R. D. 81, 82, 90
Archer, G. M. 53
Ashley, C. M. 14
Augustin, A. 16
Avioz, M. 91

Bacon, B. W. 58
Badian, E. 19
Bahnsen, G. L. 74
Baker, D. W. 50
Baldwin, J. G. 10, 53
Balz, H. 23
Bammel, E. 23
Barclay, J. 62
Barclay, O. 72
Barnett, Paul W. 18, 28, 29
Barrett, C. K. 23, 24, 26, 66, 83, 89
Barth, K. 15, 54
Barth, M. 32, 33, 35, 36, 44
Bartholomew, C. G. 54, 75, 101
Bauer, Walter 89
Baum, A. D. 68
Baur, F. C. 32, 63, 64, 65, 68, 69
Becker, Carl L. 74
Beckwith, P. 4
Bekker, I. 21
Bellas, B. M. 25
Benoit, P. 33
Berger, Klaus 92
Berkhof, L. 5, 8, 72
Berkowitz, L. 19
Bernheim, E. 32
Best, E. 65
Betz, H. D. 81, 90
Betz, O. 63, 69
Beyer, H. W. 30
Billerbeck, Paul 24, 28, 53, 84, 85
Black, D. A. 75
Black, H. C. 23
Black, Matthew 48
Blackman, P. 25
Blaiklock, E. M. 80
Blamires, Harry 103
Blanke, H. 32, 33, 35, 36, 44
Block, D. I. 51
Bloedhorn, H. 91
Bock, D. L. ix
Bockmuehl, M. 62
Borgen, P. 62, 87, 90, 91
Bornkamm, G. 57, 62, 63
Botterweck, G. J. 50
Bousset, W. 44, 69
Boyce, J. P. 12
Boyd, G. A. 14, 16
Brandon, S. G. F. 63
Branick, V. P. 61
Braude, W. G. 91
Bray, G. 15
Bright, John 52
Brightman, E. S. 13, 14, 73
Brinker, R. 51

Bromiley, G. W. 53, 96
Brown, C. 80
Brown, R. E. 90
Brownlee, W. H. 56
Bruce, F. F. 36, 37, 72, 102, 105
Büchsel, F. 41
Bühner, J. A. 23
Bullmore, M. A. 82
Bultmann, Rudolf 57, 61, 63, 69, 74
Burchard, C. 83, 85
Burney, C. F. 44
Burton, E. de W. 39, 48
Byrskog, S. 62, 80

Cadbury, H. J. 85
Cadoux, T. J. 19
Calhoun, D. B. 72
Calvin, John 2, 5, 12
Campbell, A. F. 52
Campbell, R. A. 30
Campenhausen, H. v. 103
Cannon, G. E. 33, 35, 36, 67
Capes, D. B. 43
Carmignac, Jean 48
Carpenter, E. 80
Carson, D. A. 70, 73, 101
Cassuto, U. 50
Catchpole, D. 59
Chadwick, H. 81
Chapman, S. B. 51
Childs, B. S. 49
Chilton, B. 62
Clair-Tisdall, W. St. 49
Clarke, A. D. 94
Clines, D. J. A. 10
Clouse, R. C. 1
Commager, H. S. 74
Conzelmann, H. 42, 48, 57, 61, 64
Cranfield, C. E. B. 21, 40, 43
Crossan, J. D. 63
Cullmann, O. ix, 11, 12, 44, 52, 69, 85

Dallimore, A. A. 7, 71
Danker, F. W. 89
Daube, D. 23, 35, 44, 61, 69, 89, 93
Davidson, F. 5
Davies, P. R. 56
Davies, W. D. 44, 48, 65, 69, 70, 83, 86, 91
Deichgräber, R. 36
Deissmann, A. 19, 41, 63
Delling, G. 45
Dessau, H. 19
Dibelius, M. 67
Dix, G. 30
Dockery, D. S. 74
Dodd, C. H. 62, 69
Dodds, E. R. 53
Doeve, J. W. 61, 69
Dommershausen, W. 80
Douglas, J. D. 72
Driver, S. R. 82
Dudley-Smith, T. 72
Duncan, G. S. 34
Dungan, D. L. 104, 106
Dunn, J. D. G. 35, 36, 37, 40

Edwards, Jonathan 5, 10, 12, 71
Elliott, M. A. 70
Ellis, E. Earle ix, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 15, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90 91, 92, 93, 96, 99, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106

Elwell, W. A. 48
Engberg-Pedersen, T. 81, 82, 86
Erickson, M. J. 14, 72, 73, 74
Eriksson, A. 30, 82
Evans, C. A. 81
Evans, E. 32

Fairbairn, Patrick 48
Farmer, W. R. 106
Farrer, A. 58
Fee, G. D. 34
Finer, S. E. 104
Fischer, B. 3, 39
Fitzmyer, J. A. 83, 86, 88
Floyd, M. H. 52
Foerster, W. 77
Fosdick, H. E. 71
Freedman, D. N. 33
Frye, N. 105
Fuchs, Ernst 57
Funk, R. W. 63
Furnish, V. P. 33

Gabler, J. P. 69
Gagnon, R. A. J. 78
Gardner, P. D. ix,
Gärtner, B. 23, 91
Geiger, A. 49
Geisler, N. L. 73
George, D. 2
George, T. 2
Georgi, D. 67
Gerhardsson, B. 61
Gitay, Y. 91
Glover, T. R. 83
Godet, F. L. 48
Goodacre, M. 59
Gooding, D. W. 57
Goppelt, Leonard 52, 67
Gordley, M. E. 36
Grant, F. C. 82
Grant, R. M. 82
Gray, T. 14
Green, Joel B. 80
Green, T. S. 18
Green, W. H. 50, 72
Grudem, W. A. 73, 101
Gruenler, R. G. 13

Haenchen, E. 83, 88
Hammond, G. L. 19, 20
Harnack, A. von 25, 26, 28, 32, 69, 73
Harrer, G. A. 19, 20, 21
Harrison, R. K. 10, 48, 53
Hart, J. G. 72
Hartman, L. 11, 82
Haster, J. H. 14
Hatch, E. 24, 81
Hawthorne, G. F. 20
Hayes, John H. 47, 82, 98
Hegel, Georg 63, 64
Heinrici, C. F. G. 91
Hemer, C. J. 64
Hengel, M. 61, 83, 85, 86
Hesse, C. 77
Hicks, E. L. 82
Hilgenfeld, A. 32, 68
Hill, D. 41
Hillard, T. W. 53
Hodge, C. 12, 13, 72, 102
Hofmann, J.C.K.von 52
Horgan, M. P. 56
Horst, P. W. van der 86, 89
Hort, F. J. A. 69
House, H. W. 73
Hull, G. G. 73
Hunt, D. 8

Ilan, T. 18
Inge, W. R. 78

Jackson, F. J. Foakes 19, 20, 85
Jastrow, M. 57
Jenkins, P. 59
Jeremias, J. 57, 83
Johnson, A. R. 50, 51, 54
Johnson, S. E. 82
Judge, E. A. 53, 70
Juster, J. 26

Käsemann, Ernst 43, 57
Kaufmann, Y. 50
Keck, L. E. 64, 65
Kennard, D. 73
Kennedy, G. A. 91, 92
Kenyon, J. 74
Kern, P. K. 82
Kilpatrick, G. D. 58, 106
Kim, S. 37, 43, 70
Kimball, C. A. 62
Kirk, K. E. 30
Klein, J. 103
Kloppenborg, J. S. 59
Knowling, R. J. 83
Knox, J. 32, 65, 88
Kofoed, J. B. 50
Kraus, H. J. 50
Krauss, S. 25, 89
Kroeger, C. C. 73
Kroeger, R. C. 73
Kroll, W. 19
Kuhn, K. G. 42
Kümmel, W. G. 32, 34, 48, 52

Ladd, George E. 48, 52, 69
Lake, K. 19, 20, 85
Lambert, W. G. 48
Lange, J. P. 48
Layton, B. 22
Leeuwen, R. C. Van 101
Levison, J. R. 81, 91
Lewis, C. S. 72, 76
Lieberman, S. 89
Lightfoot, John 23
Lightfoot, J. B. 21, 23, 28, 30, 32, 35, 36, 40, 67, 69, 73, 85
Litfin, A. D. 30, 82
Loetscher, L. A. 65
Logan, A. H. B. 23
Lohmeyer, E. 58, 67
Lohse, E. 24, 33, 35, 36, 37, 41, 44, 45, 66
Lonergan, B. 42, 74
Longenecker, R. N. 64, 97
Longman, T. 80
Lusk, H. F. 23
Luther, M. 5, 12, 47, 105

Machen, J. G. 69, 71, 72
Mack, Burton L. 82
Makkai, Valerie B. 103
Manson, T. W. 30, 65
Manson, W. 61
Marsh, Herbert 58
Marshall, I. H. 43
Martin, D. B. 81
Martin, Ralph P. 35, 37
Martin, Robert P. 72
Martínez, F. G. 42
Mayerhoff, E. T. 32
McAfee, C. B. 105
McBeth, H. L. 72
McDonald, H. D. 105
McKim, D. K. 48, 72
Meeks, W. A. 76, 81, 93, 100
Merkle, B. M. 30
Meyer, E. 19
Meyer, H. A. W. 34, 36
Meyer, Rudolf 44
Michaelis, J. D. 58
Michel, O. 48, 57, 90, 91
Millard, A. R. 48, 50
Miller, E. L. 100
Mitchell, M. M. 82, 90
Moffatt, James 25, 59
Morgan, T. D. 64
Morris, L. 41, 72
Motyer, J. A. 55
Moule, C. F. D. 31, 37, 42, 65
Moyle, J. B. 23
Munslow, A. 74
Murphy-O'Conner, J. 33, 42, 67, 87
Murray, I. H. 7, 14, 72

Nestle, E. 87
Neusner, Jacob 81
Nichols, A. H. 101
Nicoll, W. R. 83
Nicolosi, J. 78
Nida, E. A. 101

Noble, T. 72
Norden, E. 35, 36, 81, 83, 87
Nork, F. 87
Noth, M. 51, 52

O'Brien, M. A. 52
O'Brien, P. T. 33, 34, 35, 41
Oden, T. C. 74
O'Neil, J. C. 65
Oswalt, J. N. 55

Packer, J. I. 12, 15, 96
Parry, R. 80
Patrick, J. 82
Pauly, A. 19
Person, R. F. 51
Petrement, S. 23
Phillips, V. C. 98, 100
Pinnock, C. H. 13, 14, 15, 16, 73
Plummer, A. 34
Polhill, J. B. 19
Pollock, J. C. 72
Porter, Stanley E. 77, 82, 91
Poste, E. 23
Poythress, V. S. 73, 101, 103
Preus, R. 105
Provan, I. W. 56

Rad, G. von 51, 52
Ramsay, W. M. 19, 83
Ranke, L. von 74
Rawlinson, A. E. J. 69
Redpath, H. A. 24
Reed, J. T. 82
Reicke, B. 34, 60
Renan, E. 86, 87
Rengstorf, K. H. 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 48, 57
Rice, R. 15
Richards, E. R. 33, 67, 87, 90
Ridderbos, Herman 43, 52, 69, 70
Riesenfeld, H. 61
Riesner, R. 20, 61
Ringgren, H. 50
Robertson, A. 34
Robertson, A. T. 48
Robertson, E. 51
Robinson, H. W. 30
Robinson, J. A. T. 68
Robinson, J. M. 59
Rodd, C. S. 60
Rogers, J. B. 72
Roller, Otto 33, 67, 87
Römer, T. 52
Rordorf, W. 52
Rudolph, K. 23

Sanders, E. P. 70
Sanders, J. T. 67
Sapp, D. A. 39
Schaff, P. 1, 2, 16
Schlatter, A. 62, 70
Schmidt, P. L. 63
Schmithals, W. 22, 67
Schnabel, E. J. 85
Schrage, W. 93
Schreiner, T. R. 40, 70
Schubert, P. 64, 65
Schürer, E. 85, 93, 99
Schweitzer, Albert 63
Segbroeck, F. van 60
Selwyn, E. G. 35, 67, 87
Sevenster, J. N. 89
Shavit, Y. 89
Shedd, R. P. 69
Sherwin-White, A. N. 20
Sigal, P. 61
Simeon, Charles 71
Sinkinson, C. 14
Sjöberg, E. 44
Smit, J. 82
Smith, A. 53
Smith, C. B. 23
Smith, D. M. 53
Smith, W. 19
Smith, W. R. 51
Son, S. Aaron 6, 40, 69, 99, 100
Stanton, E. C. 76
Stegner, W. R. 61

Steinmann, A. E. 53
Stemberger, G. 76
Stendahl, Krister 44, 56, 85
Stonehouse, N. B. 58, 72
Stott, J. 46, 72
Strack, Herman L. 24, 53, 76, 84
Strecker, Georg 48, 61, 64, 69
Strong, A. H. 12
Sullivan, F. A. 30
Swinburne, R. 14

Taylor, V. 59
Temporini, H. 65
Theron, D. J. 32, 34
Thiselton, A. C. 29, 34, 75, 101
Thomas, W. Griffith 5
Thompson, Francis 4
Thompson, T. L. 56
Thrall, M. E. 29, 90
Thuesen, P. J. 101
Thyen, H. 89
Tigchelaar, E. J. C. 42
Tombs, D. 77
Tomson, P. J. 92
Too, Y. L. 90
Townsend, J. 91
Travers, M. E. 80
Turner, H. E. W. 62, 69
Turner, M. L. 23
Turner, N. 83

Unnik, W. C. van 48, 83, 84, 87, 88

VanGemeren, W. A. 50
Vanhoozer, K. J. 74
Vanhoye, A. 81
Van Til, Cornelius 74
Vielhauer, Philipp 57
Vincent, R. 61
Viviers, H. 91
Volgelstein, H. 24
Vos, Geerhardus 52, 72

Walker, W. O. 66
Waltke, B. K. 50
Wansbrough, H. 61
Warfield, B. B. xi, 41, 54, 72, 80, 96, 102, 105
Watson, D. F. 82, 91, 92
Weima, J. A. D. 75
Weiss, J. 63
Wellhausen, J. 50, 58
Wengst, K 36
Wenham, G. J. 50
Wesley, John 71
Westcott, B. F. 43, 69
Whitefield, George 71
Whitehead, A. N. 13
Whittuck, E. A. 23
Whybray, R. N. 30
Wikgren, A. 82
Wilckins, U. 45
Williams, A. L. 26
Williams, F. 26, 77
Williams, R. 81
Williamson, H. G. M. 52, 55
Willoughby, H. R. 82
Wilson, R. McL. 23
Winter, B. W. 94
Wiseman, D. J. 50
Wissowa, G. 19
Wolter, M. 36, 37
Woodbridge, J. D. 72
Wrede, William 58, 63
Wright, C. J. H. 80
Wright, N. T. 44
Wright, R. K. M. 15
Wuellner, W. A. 82, 92

Yadin, Y. 42
Yamauchi, E. M. 23
Yarbrough, R. W. 81
Young, E. J. 48
Young, F. 81

Zahn, T. 20, 68, 69, 73
Ziegler, K. 63

Index of Subjects

Acts 63, 65
anthropomorphisms 14n
antinomy 12, 15
Arminian Articles 1
Arminianism 8, 13f.

Baur tradition 22, 63–4, 68

biblical interpretation
  Evangelical interpretation 71–3
  hermeneutical traditions 70–3
  literary interpretation 75–8
  method 73–8
  New Testament 57–70
  Old Testament 49–57
  perspectives 47–79
  postmodernism 74–5
biblical paraphrase 101–6

canon 53–7
Colossians 31–46
  historical setting 1–35
  literary form: Col. 1:12–20 35–8
  teaching: Col. 1:12–20 38–46
confessional traditions 70–3
Cynic-Stoic philosophy 21–2

Deuteronomistic history 51–2
dynamic equivalence theory 96–106

egalitarianism 73, 104
election, *see* God, salvation
Enlightenment 15, 52n, 62
equality and rank 104
Evangelicalism 2, 5
Evangelical tradition 71–3

feminism 73, 75n–76
feminist
  biblical paraphrase 98–101
  ideology 78–9, 98
finite God 13–17
four allied apostolic missions 62, 67
free will 5, 8–12, 14–15
free will theism 13–17
French Revolution 14, 76

Gnosticism 22–3, 70–1
God
  election 3–7, 18n
  foreknowledge 12, 14
  omniscience 12, 17
  predestination 16n, 21, 80
  salvation 39–42, 47
  sovereignty 1, 17
  transcendence 16
Gospels 58–63
  formation 60
  form criticism, classical (1920–1950) 60–2
  form criticism, recent (1960–2000) 61–2
  Q 58–60

Graeco-Roman rhetoric 61, 80–95

Hegelian interpretation 32, 50, 63–4
historical-critical interpretation 73–4
historical reconstruction
  Acts 64
  Hegelian 63–4
Holy Spirit 104–5
homoeroticism = homosexualism 77–8

human reason 15
human responsibility 7, 46
Hyper-Calvinism 7–8

interpolations 65–6

Jesus
  historical 62–3

liberation theology 77
literary interpretation 75–8

Midrash 45

neopaganism, *see* secularism
New Testament
  chronology 64
  interpolations 65–6
  issues 57–70
  letters 63–6
  theology 69–70
  traditions, preformed 66–8

patriarchy 104
Paul
  Apostle of Christ Jesus 21–30
  background 83–9
  Jewish-Christian Prophet 90, 92–5
  name 18, 20–1
  opponents 66–7
  preformed traditions 67–8
  rhetorician 89–95
philosophies of biblical translation 97–8
postmodernism 74–5
predestination, *see* God, salvation
priests 51–2, 54
process philosophy 13–14
prophetic schools
  Prophets 51, 54–7

Q 58–60

rabbinic Judaism 56–7, 61–2, 69n, 76
rationalism 15
Reformed confessions 2
Roman citizenship 18–21

salvation, reformed
  election 3–7, 18n
  faith 2
  grace 3–4
  perseverance 4–5
  predestination 6, 8–12, 18, 41
  repentance 2
  sin 3
  understanding of 2–12, 38n–42
salvation history 52
secularism 105
Shaliah? 23–30
sovereign grace of God 3–4

Talmud 56–7
Targum 57, 98
textual criticism 106
traditions
  formation (New Testament), *see* New Testament
  formation (Old Testament) 35–6, 50–7

Pentateuchal 50–1
TULIP 2
verbal inspiration 53, 101–2, 105
wisdom 15, 44–5
Word of God 27–9, 53, 60–2, 104–6